

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VII SEPTEMBER, 1906 NO. 3

The Program of Socialism. *

M. RANC recalled this morning the words uttered by Blanqui in 1869: "Socialist thought is still in the critical period."

Very well, it cannot abandon its role of critic of the evils of existing society, but I think that to the degree that the theoretical investigation of the Socialist Party is extended, to the degree that the political representation of the working-class increases in Parliament, and its economic organization outside, socialism should also function as an organic force.

And this is why I have tried in a few words to sketch now and here a complete solution. In order to do this with any effect and with any dignity it is necessary that I have the complete attention of the Chamber and I ask you therefore not to interrupt me with continuous questions, anticipating my thought and thereby preventing an explanation which is only possible if it is produced in some sequence and with some liberty. (*"Good, good, speak, speak."*)

If then, gentlemen, I have declared that it is impossible to say with certainty how in the midst of a social transformation, in the midst of a social revolution, general expropriation of capitalist property may be brought about; whether it shall be with compensation or without compensation, this is not due to any

* In response to a challenge from the Minister of the Interior, Clemenceau, to supplement destructive criticism of the Ministry with a constructive plan Comrade Jaures proceeded to set forth the entire socialist position in one of the most remarkable speeches ever delivered in a legislative body. The first half of the speech is largely confined to a criticism of the measures of the ministry in crushing the recent miners' strike, and in showing the concentration of wealth in France. As this matter is of less interest to American readers, we have taken the liberty of omitting it, thereby shortening the speech nearly one-half.—Ed.

underlying uncertainty of my thought, or to my own doubts. It is because in these matters programs, even the most clear, the most complete and the most deliberate, are subject to the force of events. (*"Good, good," from the extreme Left.*)

You have had a proof of this in the great French Revolution, which commenced by decreeing expropriation with compensation, the purchase of most of the feudal rights, and which at last, drawn on and exasperated by battle, proceeded to this expropriation without compensation.

And you are seeing, gentlemen, at this very moment in which I speak an analogous crisis at the other end of Europe. There is there a great assemblage, the first national assemblage of the Russian people, which is considering methods of giving the earth to the peasants through great expropriations. The directing parties of this assemblage propose to give the earth to the peasants through the expropriation, with compensation, of the great private estates. Gentlemen, it is not for them to tie the future to this formula: they will accomplish their aim if liberty is established upon a base of legal evolution; but if the blind resistance to power brings about uprisings and *jacqueries*, it is probable that expropriation will take other forms.

This is the reservation which I have made for myself. I have neither the foolishness nor the wickedness to pretend to determine in advance the conditions of the working-class in the world of labor. I know and I proclaim that the right to work is sovereign and I will associate myself in whatever hour that the world of labor wishes to formulate this new society,—I will join myself with all my heart and all my mind to any effort necessary to the transformation. (*Applause from the extreme Left.*) But I have the right, before parliament, before the proletariat, to set forth as a hypothesis a legal transformation and a regular and peaceful evolution, because I maintain passionately that this hypothesis may be realized, and I shall work for it, we will always work for it, my friends and I.... (*from the extreme Left, "All of us, all of us"*), and all of our forces will associate themselves with the policy of democracy and the reforms which increase the legal power and the definite means of action of the working-class. It is with this thought, it is with this hope, that I invoke the authority, freely, endorsed by our own reason, of all the socialist theoreticians who have under the most diverse conditions and in the interest of the social revolution, advised expropriation with compensation. Marx, himself, according to Engels, spoke these strong words: "Even if we may proceed by compensation, the revolution will be cheap." It was his opinion that it might be possible to carry on these transactions without suspending for a single moment the productive activity of the country. What Marx has thus formulated, Kautsky has inter-

preted in his commentary upon the socialist platform of Erfurt, in saying, "Expropriation does not necessarily signify spoliation." In the same sense our friend Vandervelde has expressed himself, and I ask permission of the Chamber to put before your eyes the striking and powerful page which has been bequeathed to international socialism by Liebknecht:

"Social Democracy is the party of all the people, with the exception of 200,000 great capitalists, country lords, bourgeois and priests. It is then toward the whole people that we ought to turn, whenever an occasion is offered to furnish them practical propositions and projects of law of general interest, as a proof of the fact that the good of the people is our only end, and the will of the people our only law. Without violence to anyone, but with firm purpose and unchangeable will, we ought to go forward on the road of legislation. Even those who are to-day enjoying privileges and monopolies ought to be made to understand that we do not propose any violence or sudden measure against the situation sanctioned by law, and that we are resolved in the interest of a quiet and peaceful revolution to bring about the transition from legal injustice to legal justice, with the greatest possible care for the persons and the conditions of the privileged and the monopolists. We recognize that there would be an injustice in rendering those, who are placed in a privileged situation, supported by bad legislation, personally responsible for this bad legislation and to punish them for it. We expressly declare that it is in our opinion a duty of the state to give to those who may be injured in their interests by the necessary abolition of laws hurtful to the common interests as much of a compensation as is possible and is reconcilable with the interests of the whole. We have a higher conception of the duty of the state to individuals than our adversaries and we ought not to deviate from it, even when we have our adversaries in front of us."

Gentlemen, it is in this spirit that we approach the problem, and it is in this spirit that we demand of you, "How are you going to proceed to the social transformation?"

How are you going to take away from the privileged class the means of production which they control and which are in fact instruments of domination and exploitation over the mass of the proletariat?

How are you going to do it, gentlemen? You may do it without disorder, without violence, without spoliation, without confusion; you may do it by legal and social means which are now at your disposal. You have the power now, if you wish to make an end of the regime of classes, of exploitation of labor by capital, of man by man, if you wish now to apply to all capitalist property the law which is in your codes, the law of expropriation in the interest of the public welfare, by means of a just and rea-

sonable compensation. (*Applause at the extreme Left, disorder in the Center and the Right, and in several seats at the Left.*)

It is for the public welfare that the mines, the forests, the great estates should no longer be the exclusive property of a minority; it is for the public good that society should no longer be divided into two classes: one class possessing all the means of production, and the other permitted to use the strength of its arms only by accepting conditions the first of which is paying tribute; it is for the public welfare that labor should no longer be a perpetual matter of struggle between capitalists and wage workers.

The other day M. Millerand, when he laid his proposal concerning compulsory arbitration and collective bargaining before this body, said that it was necessary as much as possible to put an end to strikes, which are an economic civil war. But economic civil war does not find its only expression in the superficial phenomena of the strike. It is at the very foundation of society, (*"That's right, that's right," from the extreme Left*) it is at the very bottom of the system of property, which gives power to one class and compels obedience by the other. (*Applause at extreme Left.*) Economic civil war, social war, will continue, sometimes open, sometimes concealed, sometimes violent, sometimes quiet, but always with the same sufferings, the same exasperations, the same evils, so long as the world of production is disputed over by two antagonistic forces. There are no means, (you are listening to me, gentlemen), of definitely reconciling these forces. You may palliate the conflicts, you may deaden the shocks, yet you cannot remove the fundamental permanent antagonisms resulting from just these privileges of property. There is only one way to abolish this antagonism, and that is to re-absorb capital into labor; it is so to arrange things that there will be only one possessing and directing force, and that the creative force of labor. (*Applause at extreme Left.*)

If ever there was an object of the public welfare, it is certainly this. If ever there was an object and interest which justified the intervention of law in the transformation of property, it is this object, it is this interest. It is we who were in the right when we said to you: after having used the law of expropriation in the interest of public welfare to the profit of capital, after having made this law serve the purpose of permitting capital to throw its railroads across the fields of the peasants and to permit capital to erect vast structures in your great cities; after having made use of this law for the profit and power of capitalists, the hour has come when you must make use of it for the advantage of labor which now demands its rights.

M. de Baudry d'Asson.—Go say this to the peasants, they will respond.

Jaures.—Gentlemen, there are only two alternatives, whether you are blind to it or not. This transformation is inevitable. You cannot maintain the society of today, it is perishable, it is condemned, and it can disappear either by the brutal force of blind violence, or by the regulating and conciliating force of law; and when I tell you that it is by making use of this law of expropriation in the interest of the public welfare, which is in your codes, that you may transform society; I am trying on my part to remove even the possibility and even the attempt at spoliation and at solutions through violence.

The compensation which may be given by society to the holders of capital, expropriated for the profit of the collectivity of the workers, this compensation will be logically determined by the nature of the new society.

Today these values may be used by their holders for the purpose of purchasing the means of production and profit,—factories, land to be rented, titles to income; or they may be used to purchase the products. In the transformed society, when the private capital of production and exploitation will have been socialized, when the social community will have put at the disposition of the workers the means of production, then the values which have been received as compensation by the capitalists of the old order cannot be used to purchase the means of production, for rent and profit; they can be used only to purchase the products of the transformed social activity. Gentlemen, after the establishment of the law abolishing slavery, the owners of the slaves were no longer able on the morrow to use the compensation to purchase slaves. Very well, when capitalist property will have been socialized, the holders of the compensation will no longer be able to purchase either the means of production or the producers: they can purchase only the products. (*Applause at the extreme Left, disorder at the Center and Right.*)

You are astonished, gentlemen.

M. Anyard.—Not at all.

M. Jules Dansette.—We are not astonished, we are listening attentively.

Jaures.—You are astonished and you have moved about as if you were scandalized at the idea that man could no longer purchase man. (*Applause at extreme Left.*)

(*Interruptions from the Center*)

Thus, gentlemen, I reply to those who have raised the objection, "If in the expropriation of capitalism, you do not give compensation it will be brutal exploitation, and if you do give compensation, it will be the re-establishment of capital." I reply to them that between the values of the socialist society and the values of the capitalist society, there is, as I have shown you, this fundamental difference, that the first are the values of domina-

tion and exploitation, which are reproduced indefinitely at the expense of human labor, by rent, interest and profits, and that these others are values only for consumption and are exhausted in proportion and in degree of their consumption, thereby quickly relieving liberated and organized labor from all burdens. (*Applause at extreme Left.*)

By that time, gentlemen, society will have been transformed, and labor will have been freed without any violence having been done to the habits even of the privileged class. They will have before them a surplus of time which the heirs of the bourgeois revolution did not always give to the clergy and nobility, in order to enable them to adapt themselves to the new regime. Time will be given to the great possessors themselves, to the privileged themselves, to accommodate themselves to the new order, to accommodate their descendants to the new society, founded upon the equality of labor.

Very well, gentlemen, with the resources, with the social values, which will be immediately placed at the disposal of the community, by the suppression of all this which at the present time goes as interest to capital, as dividends, rents and incomes—with these social values which at the present hour exceed seven or eight billion francs a year—what will the social community do? It will undertake three great immediate reforms for amelioration of the condition of men: it will at first devote a portion of the resources placed at its disposal by the expropriation of capital to great works which will be truly of social and public interest; the multiplication of healthful and spacious lodgings, through which to draw out the multitude of mankind from the foul and dingy lodgings where capital and the tyranny of rent compel them to vegetate today. (*Applause at the extreme Left.*) It will carry to the little peasant proprietors the means of bettering their culture and of developing the fertility of the soil.

In the second place, gentlemen, by the large amounts at the disposition of society, the community will fully insure against all the risks of life, against old age and sickness, and this not alone to those who are wage workers today, but those who belong to this middle class, which only purchases at times a little of wellbeing, by infinite insecurity and anguish. (*"That's right, that's right," at extreme Left.*)

Finally all the remunerations of labor will be immediately increased according to the demand which the workers make of capital today.

What other changes will it demand? It will demand that in the mines, in the glass works and in the factories that the total-ity of unequal wages paid to the various categories of workers be raised, but that the wages be raised proportionately, and that the least, the most humble be raised most of all.

Thus, gentlemen, the social community on the morrow of capitalist expropriation will apply itself to increasing the totality of the wages of the workers and peasants, (I use the word wages for brevity), not by a leveling down of all wages to a common level; there need not be a single worker who will lose. In the great transformation which will free labor the same rule will be applied which the workers apply today when they formulate their demands in strikes: increase all the wages, but increase the lowest proportionately the most, and continue thus to the degree and the extent that the social productivity increases, until at last all the remuneration of labor will merge, not on the level of the low, but on the level of the high, in an indefinite progress. (*Applause at extreme Left.*)

Gentlemen, how will the social property and social production be officered and administered?

If there were no other machinery than the present state, (although to my mind there is too much underrating of this state), we might think it would be called upon to assume a task disproportionate to its strength.

I am not of those who,—whatever form the state of today may take and whatever it may have formerly done in the service of the privileged class—I am not of those who underrate the part taken by it and I do not associate myself in the interested attacks which are too frequently directed against the great benefits which redound from the substitution of collective action for the power of private egoism, but in the administration of the vast social domain created by capitalist expropriation, it will no longer be the bureaucratic state of today, but the democratic state assisted directly by the whole people, which will control the administration, and which will be aided in this great and difficult task by the professional groups which are formed today in all the departments of human labor. (*"That's right, that's right," from the extreme Left.*)

Gentlemen, there is a double law evident, a double tendency manifest in the society of today. On the one side there is a tendency to unity, to centralization. All the forms of labor are tending to co-ordinate themselves: chambers of commerce, and industrial and agricultural bureaus, you, yourself, in this united parliament, who are affected every day by the laws of taxation, by the octroi laws, by the customs laws are compelled to interfere in all the economic machinery. But at the same time that our societies are dominated by this law of unity, by this tendency to centralize, there is also manifest by a just and happy equilibrium a tendency to the formation of autonomous groups; municipalities which have obtained their independence to a certain degree, professional societies, trade unions, employers' associations, whose functions are extending, whose activity is develop-

ing. Very well, gentlemen, when it is necessary to take up the work of administering property, it will not be necessary to create new forces; it will only be necessary to apply, to harmonize for this purpose these two forces, these two tendencies which are combining more and more in human society. General organs of administration will be created, which will co-ordinate these professional efforts and will at the same time leave in each department of labor, under the reserve of general rules of equity, a great amount of independence and autonomy to the co-operative and local groups in such a way that the activity and initiative of each one will be stimulated under the general rule of sovereign labor. (*Applause at the extreme Left.*)

Gentlemen, whatever may be your judgment today or tomorrow upon the details of the socialist order which I have set forth and which I have attempted to define to this tribunal you cannot deny you are here face to face with a doctrine that you may judge as daring, that you may judge as utopian, vain — —

M. de Baudry d'Asson. O, yes.

"Yes," I hear. You may judge it vain, even judge it utopian; very well, other doctrines have been judged vain and denounced as utopian by the privileged classes of past times in the day when they were going to make their appearance in history. (*Applause to the extreme Left.*)

But in any case, there is before you a definite and debatable solution; you are confronted with a statement which you can understand and denounce if you wish. Then whatever you may think of our doctrines, whatever you may think of a system which declares that liberty for wage-workers and mankind is only possible through the social appropriation of private capital, I repeat, that it is nevertheless a definite doctrine which is before you: and when we speak to the proletaires, when we speak to the laborers, when we describe things to them, when we recall the evils which they endure: we shall not confine ourselves, gentlemen, to pointing out the abuses and the wounds, but we shall say to the proletaires, even at the risk of calling down upon us the animosity of the tremendous power of the privileged, which holds beneath its hand the minds of a portion even of the proletariat—we shall at least say to them: here is the explanation of your suffering, here are the roots of your evils. And it is for you to prove, gentlemen, that we are not seeking simply to irritate these suffering ones, but to heal them. Knowing well the antagonism and the irony by which any attempt to explain the new society in such an assemblage as this would be injured, I have nevertheless made this attempt, and we have been making such attempts, outside of here, every since there has been a socialist party. But because we have done this, because we have taken this responsibility, we have the right, after having endured this ridicule, to turn ourselves, not

toward the parties of reaction, but towards the parties which claim to represent democracy and progress, and we have the right to demand of them, what is your doctrine and what do you propose to do. (*Loud applause at the extreme Left.*)

Yes, what do you propose to do for the liberation and organization of labor? Gentlemen, you who are listening to me from the Left of this chamber, all you radicals and republicans, I call upon you to think, I address you, not in any spirit of provocation or defiance; I speak to you as a republican to other republicans; we have together done great things when we saved the Republic from the threat of militarism, when we freed civil society from the debris of theocracy. (*Applause at the extreme Left.*) But now that this grand work is accomplished, now that the hour has come for both of us to give all our strength, or at least our principle strength to what we both call the work of social reform, it is necessary, after the socialists have set forth their philosophy and tactics, that you explain what you mean by social evolution.

Ah! You have already done this, but in terms which call for further explanation. I have previously quoted, and I now wish to bring again before this tribune the appeal which all the radical and socialistic radical papers,—the *Radical*, *Justice*, *Rappel*..... (*Exclamations from various parts of the Chamber.*) Gentlemen, you have made a mistake in the date; I am speaking of 1885. (*Applause and laughter.*) In 1885 when the Socialist Party was composed of a bare handful of propagandists, and a few fighters just returned from exile, having but the slightest influence upon universal suffrage, even in the great cities; at this time when the radicals, wishing to tear the opportunists from power, called upon the working class, all the great organs of radicalism, *Rappel*, *Radical*, *Justice*, of which M. Clemenceau, as you know, was then the editor.....

M. Aynard. Where were you then, M. Jaures?

M. Jules Dansette. You were then in the Center, M. Jaures.

Jaures. Where you now are, M. Aynard, and you are still young enough to travel the same road that I have.

All these papers published a manifesto to the citizens of Paris, from which I now quote two sentences: "Our spirit is the spirit of revolution. At home there is no other aim than complete social justice.

"Whoever is not a socialist today is not a republican. It is necessary that credit be put at the disposal of the workers to permit them to escape from wage-labor."

And then, gentlemen, follows period after period, declaration after declaration, in which the radicals and the socialistic-radicals continue this same condemnation against the wage system. They have declared that there was a contradiction between an economic system, which made the wage worker a serf, a de-

pendent individual, and the republican system, which made him a citizen and a free man, a part of the government. You have all said to the producers, to the workers, industrial or peasant: The wage system is only a stopping place, the wage system can be only a transitory system. They were not the only ones to say this, and the *Debats* was scandalized, not long ago, when M. Siegfried himself denounced wages as a transitory form.

Very well, gentlemen, you owe the Republic a clear explanation. If you do not know how the working-class can escape from the wage system, if you are not sure of the means by which it can free itself, if you do not have within your minds, the idea, the type of a new society it was a great imprudence, a great mistake, for you to succeed in discrediting among the working-class a system which you are not sure of being able to abolish. (*Applause at the extreme Left.*)

Thereby you have only aroused the miserv. and aroused the hopes of the working-class to deceive them with an illusion.

We have a right to say to you: How do you expect to abolish wages? What new society do you propose to introduce? How do you wish to prepare the way? This universal credit, by means of which, in 1885, all proletarians were to be freed from capital—how do you expect to extend it? How do you wish to organize, to prepare the way?

To be sure in 1885, on the morrow of the October elections, you could not have been reproached for not remembering this statement. The Radical party then had but 150 or 160; there was a *bloc* of 200 opportunists who denounced and hindered you, and there was a strong monarchical opposition which controlled the Republican party by exploiting its divisions. Now all this is ended. The monarchical and clerical opposition is reduced by the clear will of the people to a negligible quantity. (*Applause on extreme Left, and Left.*)

* * *

In 1885 the radical and socialistic radicals, having only a minority, and held in check by the Center and Right, could not be held to account for all their social engagements. But now, through the common effort of all republicans, the Right, whether, monarchical, or nationalist or clerical, has been reduced to a negligible quantity, while on the other hand the Left, if you include those who have returned to the radicals and socialistic radicals, has a majority for the passage of any plan of social radicalism. And you, Monsieur Minister of the Interior, you, who in 1885 signed this grand promise to free the proletariat from wages, you whose friends, followers and companions in arms—many of whom, as you know, and I am proud of it, are my personal friends—have repeated this statement and this promise, you are

now not only of the party in power, but as the leader of the radical party, which for thirty years you have led to battle, you have behind you a majority which has promised the country the passage of these great social reforms. You are now in power—you are now in power, not merely nominally, no longer simply in appearance, no longer partially, no longer through a sort of weak participation, but by the combination of the accession of a radical government, of which a majority are socialistic radicals, you have power in abundance, and consequently responsibility. (*Applause at the extreme Left.*)

And therefore it is now that I ask you, for the purpose of leading the proletariat out of wage slavery, for the purpose of breaking their fetters, for the purpose of freeing the producers after having freed the citizens, for the purpose of realizing the economic and social republic, as you have realized the political republic—I ask what are you going to do?

Do not tell me that the mind of man is uncertain finding its way only by difficulties and gropings. You have said at Lyons in most beautiful language: "I am only a fallible man, who searches and gropes his way through difficulties." Oh yes, we are all fallible men, but there are hours in history where men are compelled to take sides. Such a time was that a hundred years ago, when the great revolution, of which you are the mental and physical heir; to be sure all those men, Mirabeau, and Vergniaud, and Robespierre, and Condorcet, were also subject to uncertainties and to errors; they opposed system to system and conception to conception, but also, even at the risk of injuring themselves, they decided, they dared to do. They knew that the old world was ended, was decomposing, that it was necessary to clear away the debris and install a new society, and at the risk of destroying themselves and of injuring themselves, they set forth, all of them, plans, schemes and systems. And it was not by the gropings of a superb modesty, but by the generosity and audacity which these statements reflected that the old world was abolished and the new created.

JEAN JAURES.

Translated by A. M. Simons.

What of the Democratic Party ?

I BELIEVE the answer to the above question can be correctly given in the language of the only successful presidential candidate of that party which calls itself Democratic. It has sunk into "innocuous desuetude." The strenuous times incident to the civil war effected an entirely new alignment of political parties and, in speaking of the Democratic party I mean, which is all that properly can be meant, that definite political organization which has borne the title Democratic since the civil war. Whether or not it is truly democratic and entitled to the name is beside the question.

The Republican party, under the leadership of Lincoln, freed the chattel slave. After the civil war, all the rancor it had engendered found expression, politically, through one of the two great parties. On the one hand was the Republican, or administrative, party, leaders and followers gathered under one banner and arbitrarily named. Under another banner, arbitrarily named Democratic, were grouped all the opposition forces, including state's rights people, disgruntled ex-slave holders, political leaders not *en rapport* with the administration, etc. That the names were purely arbitrary is proved by the fact that Jefferson, the patron saint of a large part of the present Democratic party, was called Republican in his own day, and recent years have developed men who call themselves "Lincoln Democrats" and "Lincoln Republicans" as opposed to some other kind of democracy or republicanism. In other words, Lincoln could have freed the slaves by either name without doing violence to its inherent meaning.

Now properly there may be at any given time two main political parties which might be called generically conservative,* consisting of those who are mainly satisfied with existing conditions, and non-conservatives, consisting of those desirous of a more or less radical change in existing conditions. Prior to the civil war, the Republican party was the non-conservative party

* Throughout this article the words conservative and non-conservative and their derivatives are used in the meaning here used, i. e., as indicating the attitude of men, parties etc., toward existing statutory laws and political institutions. For instance, the Socialists are extremely non-conservative as to present institutions and just as extremely conservative of their own principles. The Democratic party is fundamentally weak in that it is conservative in respect only of its organization and non-conservative in respect of other parties no matter what they stand for.

desiring a radical change in the abolition of chattel slavery. At the same time the Democratic party was the conservative party unwilling to interfere with the institution of slavery. But with the fulfillment of its mission, the Republican party became intensely conservative, while the Democratic party became a non-descript, desiring nothing in particular and expressing negation in general. Nor was it hardly possible, so soon after a great crisis, for an opposition party to be closely knitted together. The chief issue of a quarter of a century was definitely settled. New issues had not crystallized. Mere details of reconstruction and rehabilitation occupied the public mind.

The Republican party was formed at a time when chattel slavery, having ceased to be profitable, was about to fall. With Lincoln at its head, it became the heir of years of anti-slavery agitation. It was not, however, avowedly for the abolition of slavery. Its name was purely arbitrary and avowedly so; anti-slavery parties had existed under other names. It was temporarily bound more closely together by the fortunes of war and the conclusion of peace favorable to union. The Democratic party was in existence for a long time before the civil war, when it, too, had more or less definite principles of a conservative character. But the event that solidified the Republican party disorganized the Democratic party, leaving it a heterogeneous, conglomerate mass, single only in its opposition to the administration. And so it remained and so it is now, but of course there were during this time issues of more or less importance, and in 1884 the Democratic candidate, Grover Cleveland, was the victor in a campaign in which the tariff issue played the leading role. For the first time since the civil war, the party had apparently appealed to the people successfully on a live, radical issue. But with no attempt here to fix the blame, the fact remains that practically nothing was accomplished during Cleveland's term and he was defeated for re-election.

About this time, a phenomenon entirely new to the post-slavery, or reconstruction, period appeared. Before the war, formidable third parties were quite common; but, after the war, it was not until the years prior to 1892 that a third party worthy of the name, the Populist party, entered the lists. New issues were germinating. A large and growing number of people believed that neither the Democratic nor the Republican party either represented the people or could be induced to represent them, and the people gathered around an incoherent series of principles, calling for radical changes, forming a political party to which they gave the name Populist. In 1892, the Populist candidate received 1,200,000 votes, more than enough to attract careful consideration from the political leaders of both the other parties, and as a direct result the Democratic party thought it

saw victory in incorporating many of the doctrines of the Populists into its own platform. So thoroughly was this done that the Populist organization was satisfied to endorse the Democratic candidate. Such in brief is the story of the suicide of the Populist party.

The story of the '96 campaign is still fresh in our minds. Many believe that Mr. Bryan was really elected. But the fact remains that he was not seated, and cold-blooded history must record it as a defeat for the Democratic party. The '96 campaign left us therefore with only two political parties. The Republican party became more conservative than ever, avowedly so in fact with its "stand pat" slogan. The Democratic party seemed to have taken on new life, but it was still a nondescript. Its nucleus, to which the shrewd and calculating leaders and politicians cringed, was the "solid south," a collection of political leaders and voters living in the past and trying to sustain life on the decayed and musty corpse of several decades. Before any action could be taken the solid south must be considered and, if necessary, live issues must take a back seat for dead ones.

The 1900 campaign came on and found two distinct and widely differing factions struggling for the control of the organization of the Democratic party. Those who had left the party as "gold democrats" four years previous, having become convinced of the futility of their course, now returned with professions of undying loyalty and attempted to destroy from within rather than from without. The Bryan element stood, but only half-heartedly, for the position of '96. The solid south, always inclined to anything that gave hope of victory and feeling that one try-out was enough for the free silver issue, were induced to believe that the Spanish war had provided an issue by which the Republican party's tendon of Achilles could be reached, and accordingly anti-imperialism was made the paramount issue. Thus again was the battered and bandied, view-with-alarm platform amended and patched and offered for sacrifice. It was still considered non-conservative; but, more in spirit perhaps than in word, it was a distinct withdrawal from the '96 position.

But if the Democratic party stepped back in 1900, 1904 found it in full retreat. "Safe, sane and conservative" was boastfully made its slogan. Two chief reasons contributed to this complete change of front. First, two defeats on a so-called radical platform had left the impatient, office-hungry leaders, north and south, in despair. And, second, through the unforeseen death of President McKinley and the consequent advancement to leadership of Theodore Roosevelt, popularly considered a non-conservative, it was believed that the Republican party was in a fair way to forsake its pristine conservatism, leaving not only room but glorious opportunity for victory for a party conservative

in leadership and battle-cry. And so the poor old platform was pulled apart and pieced together once more. And once more it met with failure, more dismal than ever. The water-logged craft with motley sails was nearly submerged. The Republican party retained its conservative support and gained much of the non-conservative element, Bryan's efforts to the contrary notwithstanding.

But Roosevelt came a long way from getting all the non-conservatives. Nearly a half million voters supported neither ticket, which brings us to the consideration of the second important third party movement since the civil war. The suicide of the Populist party simply dissolved a particular political organization. It removed no issue; it crushed no truth! it changed no law of nature; it disproved no theories; nor did it change any man's opinion. It was thought merely as a matter of expediency that fusion with the Democratic party would more quickly and more surely establish those principles contended for by the Populists. The Populists had begun by attaching a name to a given set of principles; they had ended by attaching the same set of principles to a name. In the meantime, however, the spirit of radical non-conservatism had found a new vehicle. The Socialist party, prior to 1900, was an inconsiderable political factor in this country, and in that year it polled less than 100,000 votes. But though its numbers were small, in the absolute, they were large in view of the fact that they showed a two hundred per cent increase since 1896. Then, when in the four years following, they jumped to nearly half a million, a gain of almost five hundred per cent, the Socialist party was no longer simply a political theory but a tangible reality as well.

The last campaign left us therefore with a strongly entrenched conservative party with a slight admixture of non-conservatism, the Republican party; a large but divided nondescript party neither conservative nor non-conservative, the Democratic party; and a relatively small but well-organized and rapidly growing non-conservative party, the Socialist.

In 1904 the Democratic party was the only one that lost ground. In that year, things were so bad that the solid south was dissolved by the overturning of Missouri. The only prominent local Democratic victories the same year were the election of the three governors, Douglas, Folk and Johnson of Massachusetts, Missouri and Minnesota respectively. The first was on the tariff issue, the second on the graft issue, and the third was a purely personal victory. Massachusetts has since elected a Republican governor.

Since then the only notable success of the Democratic party was the election of a Democratic governor in Ohio, but the importance of this is more apparent than real. Governor Herrick,

Republican, a protege of the redoubtable Hanna and a notoriously poor politician and diplomat, had grievously offended the church and temperance element of Ohio and was standing for re-election. To capitalize the bitterness against him, the Democratic party nominated a man known to be radically opposed to the liquor traffic and a prominent church man, John M. Pattison. But it was a matter of comment at the time of his nomination that he did not mention the Democratic party and he was afterwards at pains to emphasize the non-partisan character of his election.

Almost everywhere else, lassitude concerning things bearing the name Democratic is found. The literature of exposure has besmirched the Democratic party fully as much in proportion to the number of offices it holds as it has the Republican. Tammany, the largest single Democratic organization in the country, is a stench in the nostrils of everyone. In many places, the Democratic organization has been shown to be but the graft-partner of the Republican party or vice versa. A wave of protest finds expression through "Independent," "Good Government," "Citizens" and other similarly named organizations. An avowed Democrat must explain what kind of Democrat he is, whether a Bryan, or a Parker, or a Jefferson, or a Hearst Democrat. He must tell whether he believes in free silver or the gold standard; whether he stands for free trade or tariff for revenue only; or a mere revision designed to curtail the profits of only the most flagrant beneficiaries of the tariff; and he might have to explain whether he was a "democratic Democrat" or a "plutocratic Democrat" or a Democrat for revenue only. For of such a collection of divergently opinionated people is the Democratic party made up.

As such it approaches the campaign and as such it must enter the convention of 1908, which is but two short years away and for which the stringing of wires has long since commenced. What will the Democratic party do in that convention? The answer is obvious. It will haul out the old platform, put a few patches on it and offer it to the people. It cannot do otherwise than continue to be a compromise. The conservative faction controls the organization. The non-conservative faction will not fail to be conciliatory. And the solid south (with one state gone) is always loath to do anything that might drive away a few votes. Hearst may lead the ticket and may lead it to victory. Bryan may lead it to victory, lured by some popular issue and leader.

Both Bryan and Hearst are ambitious. If Bryan is nominated it is not unlikely that Hearst may become an independent or a "public ownership" candidate, as in the New York municipal election, with a considerable following behind him. Such an event would but further disorganize the Democratic party.

But while these men and their associate politicians are sparring for personal and party supremacy, the inexorable laws of capitalistic production are continuously drawing more distinctly the line that separates society into two classes, the "haves" and the "have-nots," the capitalists and the laborers, the privileged and the exploited, the captains of industry and the wage slave. The middle class, the small dealer, is rapidly disappearing. In rare cases, he becomes identified with the ruling powers of the trusts, but more often he is forced into the working class, receiving wages either directly or as a stipulated commission, miscalled profits, on sales.

Thus, as the middle class disappears, the party of the middle class, the Democratic party, must disappear when the political arena will be occupied by two parties, the Republican and the Socialist, representing respectively the two above-mentioned classes.

Nor is it possible for the Democratic party to avert this impending dissolution. We have already seen the disastrous results consequent upon its attempt in 1904 to usurp the functions of the Republican party. That will not be tried again. If it attempts to occupy a middle ground, as is most likely and as it has done in the past, facing Janus-like, toward both capitalists and laborers, it will fail to satisfy either class, and, though under such a policy it might once more be victorious, its very victory would only serve the better to show the impotency of such a policy. But if, which is almost beyond the range of possibilities, a majority of the Democratic party should favor and adopt the complete Socialist platform, it could not but drive a large minority of its membership into the Republican party, while the people who sympathize with Socialism would be more likely to vote the regular Socialist ticket than for a lot of sudden, half-baked converts.

In the meantime the Socialist party grows apace. The chief tenet of its platform, the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution, is the same to-day as it was fifty years ago and it will be the same in years to come.

The Socialist party offers no nourishment to the capitalist. Both the Democratic and Republican parties recognize him as an eternal necessity. When it is realized that the fundamental and therefore the only political issue is between capitalist and laborer, and the hosts of those two inherently inimical forces are deployed upon the political arena, the Republican party will represent the capitalist class, the Socialist party will represent the

working class and these two will contain all that once composed the Democratic party in proportion as its membership interpreted their material interests.

This time is at hand. The Democratic party will play an important role in one more national campaign and only one.

ELLIS O. JONES.

A Cry of Warning.

COMRADE Untermann has uttered a cry of warning to the readers of the REVIEW in order to put them on their guard against the false doctrines which I have been inculcating into them for the past year or so. This he does in the name of true Marxism, which he claims I misrepresent. For, says he, while the series of articles published by me in this REVIEW "contains much that is good, much that is excellent, and much that deserves to be preserved in permanent form, it also contains much that is shallow, much that is the fruit of hasty reading, and much that is false." In explanation of these peculiarities of my writings he states in his kind schoolmasterly tone that: "So long as Comrade Boudin deals merely with the simple problems of the first volume of Marx's Capital, or with the funny antics of bourgeois critics or semi-bourgeois revisionists, he is entertaining, brilliant, witty, and shows himself generally well posted.... I enjoyed that portion of his articles thoroughly, and agree that he gave to those straddlers in political economy and metaphysical history all that was coming to them. But when Comrade Boudin ventures into the deep waters of the more obtruse and complicated Marxian analyses, especially those of Capital, volume III, he gives evidence of insufficient preparation and hasty reading. Here true and false are almost inextricably mixed up by him, and the confusion created by the critics whom he scourges is worse confounded by his own attempts to straighten it out. What Boudin in reality presents on this subject is a theory of his own, not that applied by Marx in Volume III to the theory of competition."

I must confess that I was quite nonplussed on seeing this announcement coming from such a quarter. I have been working all this time to prove that the Marx critics and so-called Marxists who draw a line of division between the first and third volumes of Capital understand neither the first nor the third. That Marx's theoretical structure, embracing not only all parts of his theory of political economy but also his historico-philosophic views, forms one harmonious whole, no part of which can be properly understood without a complete mastery of the whole system, at least in its fundamental and decisive points. And all this only to be authoritatively informed at the end that I myself know only the first volume and do not know the third! My memory naturally leaped back to my boyhood days, when instead of Marx's great life-work the text-book in geography was under discussion, and my old schoolmaster informed me that I had mas-

tered Asia all-right, but was woefully deficient on Europe. And I almost instinctively asked: "And how about Africa? How about the *second* volume. Oh, dear old schoolmaster! do I or do I not know *that*?"

But just then something happened which gave my thoughts an entirely different trend. My glance fell on *The Worker*, issue of July 28, 1906, where Comrade Untermann also touches on the relation in which the third volume of Capital stands to the first. There, after stating that I was wrong in demanding from him that he should write a scientific analysis of a certain question there under discussion, because it would require the writing of a "monograph" like Capital, he makes the following statement:

"Of course, I can also write a newspaper article....setting forth more precisely why I hold this position and why I take it as scientific. But that would not be a scientific analysis. It would be an application of the results of my own personal experience to certain social conditions. It would be the difference between the third volume of Capital and the first two volumes. And it would in my opinion have very little influence on the actual development of minds. It would not reach far enough. So that after all, it would be more scientific to write the monograph or leave the proof to history."

Here was a knocker! Comrade Untermann who is so scientific that not only what he writes is scientific but even the fact itself that he writes something or does not write it is scientific, does not consider the third volume of Capital a "scientific analysis," but merely an application of the results of Marx's personal experience to certain social conditions! That sounds awfully bad for Marx. But, having my own troubles, I must leave Marx to his fate. What is of importance to me is this: How does this estimate of the third volume tally with the assertion that this very third volume is the "deep waters" of the Marxian theory, in comparison with which the matters treated in the first volume are "merely simple problems?" How is the third volume at the same time not a scientific analysis at all, but merely the comparatively negligible application of Marx's "personal experience" to certain social conditions, and the "more abstruse" and complicated Marxian analyses?"

Is it possible, thought I, that Comrade Untermann should have gotten things twisted somewhere? Of course, that was hardly likely, with the strict scientific method which he observes not only in writing but even in deciding the question what to write and what not to write. Yet, we are all only human, and none of us are infallible. I made a close examination, and from indications I am led to believe that he has matters hopelessly twisted all along the line. All the knots and bends cannot now be pointed out owing to the peculiar method which he has adopted

in his article, and will only become apparent after he has given us the exhaustive review of my articles, the profit and pleasure of perusing which he denied us for the present. I call his method peculiar, for the reason that to my mind the reasons given by him for not writing the exhaustive review now are quite inadequate. I certainly appreciate the fact that his writings proceed not only from scientific reasons but also from very high motives, and cannot be dictated by such ordinary considerations as the proper literature or scientific appreciation of the work "of a few authors," not to say one author, and that the only thing that could move him to write is the desire "to prevent the spread of false notions concerning the crowning outcome of Marx's great work," or some such similar motives. But the method adopted by him of giving the reader a few pickings instead of the entire review cannot possibly accomplish the desired purpose. He says that if he "can show to the reader of the INTERNATIONAL REVIEW that Boudin is untrustworthy in this one (?) respect, they will be forewarned and will take his future work with a pinch of salt." Assuming that he will succeed in his laudable ambition, and that the readers will take all my future writings with the proper dose of salt, what good will it do to the poor readers? Since he does not advise them not to "take" my articles at all, presumably because of the good there is in them which ought to be preserved, what good will the salt do them? It would not help them to separate the true from the false, which, as he himself says, are so inextricably connected? Without his guiding hand the readers may do just the reverse of what is expected from them, and salt what ought to be preserved and preserve what ought to be salted. You really never can tell what poor misguided readers may do. We therefore earnestly pray and hope that he will soon favor us and the readers of the REVIEW with the exhaustive review which he vaguely promised to give us in the future. Meanwhile and in the fond hope that he will heed our prayer, and will not demand as a condition precedent that we support him and his family for some forty years, as he did on another memorable occasion, we will proceed to take up the points which he makes in the present article.

First in point of precedence and in space occupied in Comrade Untermann's article is the question of the Price of Production. On this point Comrade Untermann cites a few phrases from one page of the article on the "Great Contradiction in the Marxian Theory of Value," skips the rest of that page and a couple more with the remark that they contain merely a vague lot of generalities, stops at another page for another citation, and then winds up with his own resume, as follows:—"In other words, this is Boudin's position: The price of production, as used in the third volume, and the costs of production, or price

of production, alleged to have been used in the earlier volumes, means essentially the same thing, only applied to different conditions. The price of production has nothing to do with the formation of the average rate of profits, for it can be formed without this rate. So far as the price of production differs from the 'ordinary' costs of production, or cost price, it is *merely* a difference between Marx's cost of production based on labor-value and capitalist cost based on heaven knows what. That is all." Heaven only knows how Comrade Untermann got to his resumé, and we will inquire into this question no further. But I must say to Comrade Untermann that he is quite wrong: his "other words" do not state my position, but merely furnish him the basis for a lot of talk about a lot of matters which have nothing to do with my position on the question of the Price of Production. My position is stated clearly and circumstantially in my articles. I will summarize it here for his benefit. I would gladly oblige him by putting it into a rhyme, as he requested me to do, but I really cannot do it. I will do the next best thing, however, and put it into the form of a resolution, as follows:

WHEREAS, sundry Marx-critics and alleged Marxists have repeatedly and noisily asserted that Marx has stated in the first and third volumes of Capital, respectively, two different theories of value, the theory of value stated in the third volume virtually abrogating, or, at least, substantially modifying, the theory of value stated in the first volume; that according to the theory stated in the first volume the value of a commodity depends on the amount of labor necessary for its (re)production, and that such value is the point about which its price always oscillates, whereas according to the theory stated in the third volume the price of a commodity may be, and usually is, permanently fixed at, or oscillates about, a point which is different from its value as measured by the amount of labor necessary for its (re)production, which is, in effect, an abandonment of the labor theory of value and a return to the "quite ordinary" theory of the cost of production;

IT IS THEREFORE DECLARED: That Marx states only one theory of value, which remains the same and unmodified throughout his entire work; that the category of the Price of Production, discussed for the first time in the third volume, does not introduce any new *principle* into the theory of value stated by Marx in the first volume, but on the contrary that the *principle* upon which it is based, (that is to say, the principle that the prices of commodities do not always, nor even regularly, conform to or oscillate about their value, but may be permanently fixed at or oscillate about a different point, owing to the fact that capitalists do not always retain, nor are they limited to the surplus-value which is created in their own business) is already

contained in the first and second volumes, and is only discussed for the first time in the third volume because here only are for the first time discussed *all* the conditions under which it is formed, notably the average rate of profit.

The reader will see that my position is substantially different from that ascribed to me by Comrade Untermann in his "other words." I will therefore not discuss the long citations from Marx, for, whatever they may or may not prove with reference to Comrade Untermann's "other words," they certainly do not contradict my position. I will however ask Comrade Untermann this plain question, to which I demand a direct and unequivocal answer: *Is my position as stated here by me true or false?* If he says it is true, that settles the question. If he says it is false, I'll take the matter up with him again. Before leaving this point, however, I must call the readers' attention to the fact that in the further discussion of this point Comrade Untermann misstates my position on a number of subsidiary points without even taking the trouble of informing the reader that he is using "other words."

The second point which Comrade Untermann mentions is my statement as to the relation of value to price. This is in my opinion one of the principal questions in the Marxian theory of value, or any theory of value for that matter, and deserves careful attention. I shall therefore go into it at some length. Comrade Untermann tried hard to create the impression that according to my interpretation the Marxian theory of value does not explain the formation of prices, and that prices do not depend on value and are the result of purely individual valuation. He attempts to accomplish this result partly by using a few sentences from my articles torn out from their context, and then by innuendo. In his zeal he goes so far as to make it appear that according to my interpretation of Marx, his theory of value and surplus-value does not explain the genesis of value! and this after his certification that I am "all right" on Asia,—beg pardon, I should say on the first volume.

Because of the importance of the subject I shall be compelled to quote Untermann's and my own articles at some length, much as I dislike to do it. Untermann says:—

"Instead of explaining the formation of the price of production, he (I) denies that the Marxian theory of value can explain, or be even "a guide to the actual prices paid for commodities. But a theory of value need not show that, and, as a matter of fact, could not. It would not be a theory of value if it did." When I read that I naturally looked for some other explanation, or at least some quibble about theory of value, theory of surplus-value, theory of prices, or theory of competition, by which he would try to escape out of this *cul de sac*. But no. So I could only say: 'Good-bye, Marx, with your theory of value which explains the formation of the actual prices paid for commodities!' For it does, even if Boudin's presentation 'as stated by Marx' denies it.... According to him,

always presenting the Marxian theories 'as stated by Marx,' value is determined by social conditions, *while price is determined by individual valuation*. 'Value being the cause of price, the chief motive of the individual making the price, will, of course, be the value of the thing priced. This does not mean, however, the actual value of the thing, but his idea of its value.' At the same time he quotes with approval the statement of Marx that capitals in spheres of higher than ordinary composition, sell their commodities above their value, and capitals in spheres with lower composition, below their value, supremely unconscious of the fact that his 'idea' of price of production cannot explain this, (?) and that *this statement contradicts his determination of prices 'by individual valuation,'* as opposed to the determination of values 'by social conditions.' As though one of Marx's great accomplishments had not been to do away with the *clash* between individual and social interpretation! Marx shows throughout his three volumes that price is *quite as much* determined by social conditions as value, and that *value is as much an individual product as price*..... I should like to have an explanation from Boudin, how a theory of surplus-value which must explain the development of profits, can do so without explaining the genesis of *value* and prices, and how a theory which is to 'attain the principal object of political economy, the discovery of the laws governing the production and distribution of profits in the capitalist system' and which 'has to record its greatest triumph' in that field, can accomplish this without explaining the transformation of value and surplus-value into prices."

To which I must again say that Comrade Untermann ascribes to me ideas which are entirely foreign to me, and gives me a position which I never held. Aside from the question of the Price of Production which I did not consider in the passages from which Comrade Untermann took the detached sentences, because I did not want to put the cart before the horses and therefore, following the example of Marx in the first and second volumes, I *assumed* that commodities are sold at their values, the true relation of price to value in the Marxian theory was clearly stated by me in these very passages. I am going to reproduce those passages, so that the reader can judge for himself and answer the questions put to me. I said :

"We must not confuse price with value. Value is something which the commodity possesses when placed on the market and before any price is paid for it, and it is because of this value that the price is paid for it. The value is the cause of the price. But value and price do not always coincide in amount. The price of an article may be greater or less than its value, according to circumstances..... and this notwithstanding the fact that value is the cause of price. The reason for this is easily discovered. Value is a social relation, and is therefore determined by social conditions, whereas price is an individual valuation and is therefore determined by individual motivation. Value being the cause of price, the chief motive of the individual making the price, will, of course, be the value of the thing priced. This does not mean, however, the actual value of the thing, but his idea of its value..... All this produces what is called the 'haggling of the market.' As a result of this "haggling" comes the *price actually paid*, and the *average of the prices paid makes the market price*. This price is purely accidental within certain limits, being the result of individual volitions based on the individual estimation. It is so within certain limits only, for *it is controlled by its primary cause-value*, which sets the standard by which it is measured and to which it naturally tends

to conform, and will conform the more the nearer to the truth are the individual estimates of the social relations and conditions, and the freer the individual motivations and conditions are from purely personal considerations. Value is the norm about which the "haggling" of the market takes place, and the price which results from this "haggling" naturally gravitates towards its norm-value.....

"The different prices at which a commodity is sold at different stages of the circulation process seemed to us inexplicable before, and vexed us not a little. *But they will be readily understood when we know that the sharing up of the surplus-value takes place in this process.....* This confusion is only apparent, however, not real. It is due to failure to distinguish between the *value* of commodities and the *prices* which they bring on a *particular* sale in the market."

It was at this point, and with reference to the prices paid on *particular sales*, that I said, after restating substantially what I have stated above at length: "Many opponents of Marx make a point of the fact that Marx's theory of *value* does not show the formation of prices, is no guide to the actual prices paid for commodities. But a theory of value need not show that, and, as a matter of fact, could not. It would not be a theory of value if it did." The introduction of the category of the Price of Production did not change the relation between value and the actual, individual, or particular price paid for a commodity, except that it substituted the price of production for the value as the norm around which the actual price oscillates, wherever a price of production is formed. Therefore, *after explaining the formation of the price of production*, I said: "A careful reading of the first and second volumes of Capital clearly shows that the price of commodities is *governed by their value*, but that it need not conform to it. Quite to the contrary. Under given conditions which are necessary at certain stages of the existence of every commodity, its price will remain constantly away from its value. *Always, however, subject to the general laws of value, and by reason of the laws of value.*"

In short: Value is the cause of the actual price and *governs it*, and is the norm to which it tends to conform, either directly where no price of production is formed or indirectly where a price of production is formed, but it is not identical with it. The norm of price, its general average, is due to social conditions, its individual variations from its norm are the result of individual volitions and valuations. This is what I said in my articles, and this is the exact relation of Value and Price as Marx understood it. And I challenge Comrade Untermann to cite one passage from Marx supporting his statement that value and price (meaning actual price, of course) are in the *same measure* "an individual product", whatever *that* may mean. Comrade Untermann tells me in a stage whisper that "In Volume III, book I, Marx wrote the following title of Chapter IX: 'The Formation of an Average Rate of Profit and the Transformation of the Value

of Commodities into Prices of Production'." To this I will simply say that besides the title Marx has written the whole chapter, which is quite a long one, and that I challenge him to bring a single statement from that whole chapter which would in any way contradict what I said about the relation of Price and Value.

The truth of the matter is that Comrade Untermann is "supremely unconscious" of the fact that he has mixed up Price of Production with the actual price paid in each individual case for a commodity on its sale, and that he has the whole question of the relation of Value to Price twisted entirely out of joint. And yet this is a very important matter. Although I cannot say with certainty whether it belongs to the "simple problems" of the first volume or the "deep waters" of the third, I am certain that it is one of the basic questions of the Marxian economic theory. In fact it is right here where in my opinion the difference begins between the Marxian theory and the so-called Austrian theory of Value, and Comrade Untermann has twisted himself over from the Marxian camp into that of the Austrians.

The third point made by Comrade Untermann against me is with reference to "absolute freedom." In order that the readers may get the full import of this momentous question and may get it from Untermann in all the fullness of thought and beauty of style, I must again quote him at length. Says he:

"Boudin finally loses all patience and repudiates not only the Marxian theory of value and surplus-value, but also the Marxian historical materialism," in the following brilliant passage, which might have been written by the most frenzied champion of *absolute freedom*:

"The profit sharing of the capitalists is *absolutely* impersonal. It also requires *absolute freedom of movement* for the different elements which go into the progress of production and distribution. Wherever there is no *absolute freedom of movement*, the laws governing the division of surplus-value among the different capitalists are interfered with *arbitrarily* and may even be *abrogated*. This is a necessary corollary to the observation already made that all the laws of value and consequently the production and realization of surplus-value require *absolute freedom of movement*." (I. S. R., p. 224.)

"What a muddle! The laws of value and surplus-value, which, remember, do *not* explain the formation of prices, according to Boudin, must have *absolute freedom of movement*, if the capitalists are to share *impersonally* in profits through prices which they fix themselves by *individual estimation* of value that has nothing to do with the *actual prices* paid for commodities! An *arbitrary* interference with, or even abrogation of, *absolutely free* movements! Make that into a rhyme, will you! And such a hash is served up to us in the name of greater clearness of thought, and in the name of a theory which teaches the relativity of all things!

So far as there is any meaning in this gem of Boudin's mind, it says just the reverse of what Marx states. For Marx says that profit sharing of the capitalists by means of an average rate of profit takes place to the extent that the law of value is abrogated, and Boudin says that it takes place only so long as the laws of value and surplus-value have *absolute freedom of movement*".....

I don't know how the readers will "take" it, but when I read this marvellous passage I "took" it seriously and literally. I immediately ordered the word "absolute" in all its forms banished from my literary household and cut it out from my writings wherever discovered. I soon found, however, that it made an uncomfortable hole, so I decided to "take" the passage with a pinch of salt and restore the offensive word, but to preface it, wherever and whenever used with the words "having in mind the relativity of all things, and in so far as anything can be said to be absolute," so that there be no mistaking the fact that I am an adherent of the "theory which teaches the relativity of all things." But I am still uneasy about the matter, and I am afraid I may have to take another pinch. What bothers me is this: Is Comrade Untermann *absolutely* certain of the relativity of all things, and how are we to understand the terrible word in such connection, *absolutely* or only *relatively*? And if only *relatively*, how *absolute* is the *relativity* of all things? Again, how are we to apply this vexing problem of Marxian methaphysics to the practice of daily life? I am, for instance, very much tempted to say that Comrade Untermann is absolutely and unqualifiedly wrong when he makes me speak, in the passage which he quotes from my article, about the "progress of production and distribution." I am quite sure, *absolutely* and without any qualification, that I never used the word "progress" which changes the whole sense of the passage, or, rather, makes it senseless and absurd. I said "*process* of production and distribution," but for some reason, relatively known to Comrade Untermann and absolutely unknown to me he quotes me as saying *progress*. What shall I do about it? Awaiting instructions from Comrade Untermann, and in view of his absolute ban on that terrible word and his relatively great renown as a careful scientist, I shall for the present use the word "absolute" only with the qualification. Therefore, I say:

Having in mind the relativity of all things, and in so far as anything can be said to be absolute, Comrade Untermann is *absolutely* wrong in the points which he makes in the passage quoted, on the whole and in each and every particular. (1) He is wrong on the question of the relation of Value to Price, and my position on that question, as already explained at length. (2) He is wrong in ascribing to me the grand conception or image of the *laws* of value and surplus-value *moving with* or without *absolute freedom*. I never conceived or imagined such an absurdity. The honor of inventing it is absolutely and unqualifiedly *his*. (3) Comrade Untermann is again wrong when he says that "Marx says that the profit sharing of the capitalists by means of an average rate of profit takes place to the extent that the law of value is abrogated." The profit sharing, of the capitalists is effected

by means of the price of production. And according to Marx the Price of production does *not* abrogate the law of value, but on the contrary is governed thereby and is formed by reason thereof. The *abrogation* of the law of value by means of the Price of Production is an anti-Marxian invention which has tripped many a Marxist, and Comrade Untermann has evidently also fallen a victim to it. (4) He is drawing on his imagination or "heavens knows what" when he says that "Boudin says that it (the profit sharing of the capitalists by means of an average rate of profit) takes place only so long as the laws of value and surplus-value have absolute freedom of movement." Aside from the beautiful image of the *moving laws* of value and surplus-value which Boudin could not have conceived, Boudin respectfully submits that there is not even a suggestion of any such position in his writings, and that Comrade Untermann again got things twisted and mixed up the "elements which go into the *process* of production and distribution" of which Boudin spoke with the laws of value and surplus-value, a very careless and reprehensible proceeding. (5) What Boudin did say, and very plainly too, is this: That the different *elements* which go into the process of *production* and distribution, principally Capital and Labor, must have absolute freedom of movement in order that the division of the surplus-value among the capitalists which is governed by the laws of value by means of the formation of the Price of Production should take place. Where there is no freedom of movement of these elements the formation of the Price of production is interfered with and may even not take place at all. And by freedom of movement of the elements of production is not meant merely "free competition, unimpaired by any monopoly," in the ordinary meaning of these words, but a lot of other things, and very important ones at that, besides. Such, for instance, as the absence of private property in land, a highly developed technique of production, and generally a highly developed stage of capitalism. This is so clearly stated by Marx, and forms such an important part of his theory, that a man must have his Marxism twisted out of shape beyond recognition in order to dispute it.

Comrade Untermann also finds fault with the statement made by me in explaining the Materialistic Conception of History that that theory is "not a theory explaining the motives which actuate individuals to act, but a historical theory explaining the motive powers which bring about those actions of the masses, the aggregate of which make up what we call history."

In my discussion of the Materialistic Conception of History, which was published in this REVIEW over a year ago, I stated at great length and with precision, my ideas on the subject, a glimpse of which the reader gets from the single sentence which Comrade Untermann tore out from its context. Comrade Untermann

thinks that in that sentence and in others I *repudiate* the Materialistic Conception of History. And yet he never thought it worth while to give the matter the attention which its importance deserves. Nor does he think it worth his while to do so now. He does not go into any examination of the subject, but simply instructs us off-hand but very categorically thuswise:

"As a matter of fact, individual actions can be, and *must* be, explained by historical materialism in the *same* way as mass actions."

I have already shown above one instance of what my alleged '*repudiation*' and his alleged support of the Marxian theories really amounts to, and I would also gladly take him up at this point if he would only deign to go into particulars and be a little more specific. Meanwhile I just quote briefly an authority although I am not in the habit of so doing, because of a peculiar coincidence. This authority was, so to speak, thrust upon me while writing this article and is the very latest thing on the subject. I have just read in No. 42 of the *Neue Zeit* (the latest issue received here) an article by Karl Kautsky, perhaps the greatest living authority on the subject, in which occurs the following significant passage which I should like the reader to carefully compare with what I said and what Comrade Untermann says on the subject. Says Kautsky: "Here friend Bauer, usually so acute, throws together in peculiar fashion two things which are very different from each other: the *actions* of individuals, and the *views* of whole classes. In so far as the first is concerned, the Materialistic Conception of History *does not always explain to us the necessity of each individual action*, although it recognizes it.

All of which makes us extremely impatient to see the rest of Comrade Untermann's points to be contained in the half-promised exhaustive review, which we do pray that he might publish as soon as possible.

L. B. BOUDIN.

Socialism in the South.

CERTAINLY no other part of the world furnishes a better field for sociological studies, or is more replete with historical events that make plain the philosophy of historical materialism than the South.

Here we have a large population of negroes, who were living in savagery two or three hundred years ago, and in chattle slavery a little over forty years ago. To note their progress, evolution, and mental development, in so short a period as a result of the various changes in their mode of life, each change bringing with it a new economic environment, better conditions, and opportunities is certainly an interesting phenomenon.

In no other part of the world has the social transformation of society from slavery to capitalism been anything like as rapid and complete as it has been in the South. To interpret the economic development of the South for the last forty years is practically to interpret the industrial progress of society for the last one thousand years.

Forty odd years ago the South was purely an agrarian country. Agriculture and the professions were the only occupations. There were no mills, mines, shops or factories and New Orleans was the only city in the South and its population was small. The southern farmers and slave owners not only controlled the South but reigned supreme in the economic and political life of America from the foundation of the republic until 1861. All this is now changed. A great revolution has taken place. Coal, iron, and gold mining are now important industries. The iron and steel industries having assumed large proportions; manufacturing of all kinds has rapidly developed. The whole country is dotted everywhere with cotton factories, and the small towns and hamlets of a few years ago are now populous industrial cities.

This transformation of the basis of society from agrarian to capitalist, brought with it corresponding changes in the religious and political as well as the economic ideals of the southern people. The ideals of the slave owning class of forty years ago in regard to law, justice, and morality have disappeared forever. The southern farmer is no longer the dictator of national policies, his voice has even been silenced in the South; the rule of the capitalist is now complete, and his ideas and ideals reign supreme.

This capitalist revolution of the South has rapidly converted all other forms of labor into wage labor. The slave owner and

slave alike have thus furnished the material for the making of the southern proletariat, but the capitalistic development of the South has been so rapid, jumping as it did from slavery to capitalism in forty years, that it has been impossible for the proletarian mind to keep pace with or adjust itself to the rapidly changing conditions. Consequently the socialist movement throughout the South is not as strong numerically, nor does it show the same amount of discipline as it does in other sections of the country. However, the economic and intellectual conditions of the working class of the South are improving rapidly.

Ten years ago the wages of a farm laborer in Georgia were seven dollars a month, three pounds of meat, one peck of meal, and a pint of molasses. Today this same farm laborer receives from twelve to fifteen dollars a month with no reduction in the allowance of rations.

The average wages for carpenters, painters, etc., ten years ago, was from a dollar and a half to a dollar and seventy-five cents per day, with scarcely no trade organization. Today the same trades average from two dollars and a half to three dollars per day, and the trade union movement is fairly well developed and everywhere throughout the South can be seen the slow but sure development of the proletarian class-consciousness.

The South is to my mind by all odds the most important field for socialist propaganda and organization. The South today is the bulwark of capitalism, is more conservative and orthodox than any other section of the country.

Native pride and political prejudice are strong characteristics of the southern people, and when our movement grows strong and threatens the supremacy of the ruling class, the strongest and bitterest opposition ever witnessed anywhere in the world will come from the South.

When the French revolutionists had overthrown the ruling class and took possession of the political power these ex-rulers went south and there organized an army, marched back to Paris, and recaptured what they had lost. The same conditions prevail in the United States today and the South is the weak spot in the American socialist movement. Here exists the material that could be used to undermine the success of the socialist movement of the nation. This condition should receive the serious consideration of the entire party membership.

At the close of the present campaign I believe that the national executive committee should take up the thorough and systematic organization of the South. The arranging of an occasional lecture tour, no matter how able the lecturer may be, will not be able to accomplish the necessary work. An organizer will need two or three months in any southern state, and will not be able to make his expenses. Most of the organizational re-

sources at the disposal of the national committee for the next few years should be devoted to the South. The work in the South will not be a pleasant task for the organizer. It is imperative that this work should be done, and that as soon as possible. It can be done best by southerners, and I believe they can be secured.

J. B. OSBORNE.

Will the Workers Bring Socialism.

WE now come to consider the *active* factor of the revolution from capitalism to socialism, — *the Proletariat*. It may be stated without any fear of contradiction that this question of the role of the proletariat in bringing about the transformation from capitalism to socialism, and how and under what circumstances it will execute this role, in which last is included the question of the so-called breakdown of capitalism, is the real bone of contention between the so-called old-school Marxists and the Revisionists, it being merely the reverse side of the question of the Social Revolution, and that all other questions are merely tributary to it. As was already stated before, the purely theoretical questions of philosophy and political economy are not the proper field of Revisionism, and these theories are drawn into the discussion in so far as they have, or are thought to have, any bearing on the present question. The paramount question of revisionism is: *Who* is going to bring about the transformation from capitalism to socialism, and *how* will it be done? Everything else is only interesting in so far as it throws some light on this subject. We have already shown in the preceding articles the role which some of our social elements, those which may be called passive, will play in this transformation and how the ground will be prepared and broken. Now we will consider the active factor, his development and the conditions under which the work can be successfully done by him.

Before proceeding any further, however, attention must be called to a peculiar feature of the discussion on this subject, which is the result of a basic misunderstanding of the Marxian theory.

Almost all of the Revisionists proceed upon the theory, more or less clearly expressed, that Marx expects the transformation from capitalism to socialism to be effected by at least two independent causes: the economic breakdown of the capitalist system, *and* the revolt of the proletariat against capitalism. Some go even so far as to split up the second cause into two: the growing weight of the burden of capitalism on the working class, and the growth of the power of the working class. Each of them therefore attempts to argue against the allowance of that particular cause, the allowance of which he thinks would interfere with the method of fighting for socialism which he thinks is the best. Most of them are vehemently opposed to Marx's supposed prediction of an economic breakdown of capitalism, the so-called *Zusammenbruchstheorie*, and try to prove that socialism will

never be brought about by that "factor" and that we must, therefore, look to other factors if we want socialism. A good many of them are also opposed to the ascribing of any great importance to the increasing burdens of capitalism on the working class, the so-called *Verelendungstheorie*.

It is sometimes really amusing to see how they argue about these "factors" or causes as if these were absolutely independent of each other and could exist one without the other and without reference to each other. One of them, the latest in the field, has even managed to show that these various factors neutralize each other by working in different directions. And none of them has ever stumbled on the fact which is as clear as day-light to those who can see, that Marx presents only *one argument* showing only *one cause* for the transformation from capitalism to socialism -- the economic development of society which evolves the economic conditions necessary for the change, and produces the social forces which will bring it about. The cause being one, its separate parts or aspects must be considered with relation to each other and with a view to the whole, and cannot be understood unless so considered. Of course the different points involved may be taken up one by one, but always bearing in mind the rest. So when we will consider here any one of these points it will always be with a view to what we have to say on the points considered before or to be considered later.

In order that we may bring out clearly before our readers the different points made, we will consider them from two points of view: first, as to how far Marx's description of the tendencies of development of capitalist society, in so far as it affects the conditions of the working class, is correct; and, second, as to what conditions of the working class *must* exist, according to Marx, in order to make it a proper vehicle for carrying out the historic mission which Marx ascribes to it. Before going into details, however, we desire to place before our readers the description of the transformation from capitalism to socialism traced by Marx himself in one of the finest passages ever penned by mortal hand:

"As soon as the laborers are turned into proletarians, their means of production into capital, as soon as the capitalist mode of production stands on its own feet, then the further socialization of labor and the further transformation of the land and other means of production into socially exploited and, therefore, common means of production, as well as the further expropriation of private proprietors, takes a new form. That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the laborer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many laborers. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the centralization of capital. One capitalist always kills many. Hand in hand with this centralization, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever-extending scale, the co-operative form of the labor process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of the instruments of labor into

instruments of labor only usable in common, the economizing of all means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialized labor, the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world-market, and with this, the international character of the capitalistic regime. Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolize all the advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."

This passage which describes *one* process, clearly indicates that Marx distinguished three moments of that process which he evidently considers of importance: (1) The technical, and, so to say, purely material side of the process, the concentration and centralization of capital, which furnishes the technical and material (in the more limited sense of the word) basis of the future society; (2) The effect of the technical and material side of the process on the members of the society, particularly the working class, which creates the active force ready and able to make the change from the present system to the future; and (3) The resulting conflict of the technical and material side of the process and the needs of society in general and of the working classes in particular, which necessitates the change.

The first moment was considered by us at length in the preceding articles; the third moment was already touched upon by us in a preceding article, and will be treated at length in the succeeding one; the second moment will be considered here.

Does the mass of "misery, oppression, slavery, degradation and exploitation" grow? The Revisionists say: *No*; the condition of the working class is improving instead of getting worse. And furthermore, say they, Marx is wrong in asserting that the growth of misery, etc., of the working class is necessary for the transition from capitalism to socialism. How, — do they ask — can a miserable, oppressed, enslaved, degraded, and exploited working class fight the battle and win the victory for Socialism? In support of their contention as to the actual condition of the working class they point to the facts, or alleged facts, that the hours of labor have shortened and the wages have increased since the writing of that passage by Marx, that the workingmen are better housed and better fed now than formerly, and that pauperism is on the wane rather than increase. They make those assertions in a manner as if they were stating undisputed facts which require no proof to support them. As a matter of fact, however, these assertions are very far from stating undisputed facts.

It is sufficient to mention some very recent literature on the subject, such as Hunter's "Poverty," Spargo's "The Bitter Cry of the Children," and the articles of Theodor Rothstein, to show that the question of poverty among the working class is as yet a much mooted question. The truth is that appearances, particularly the appearance of statistical figures in certain reports, on which the revisionists mainly base their contentions, are very deceptive.

To begin with, there are intentional deceptions in a good many of our official statistics. As an illustration in point may be taken a statistical report or abstract sent out the other day from the Bureau of Statistics in Washington. It was to the effect that during the financial year just closed wages had increased one and a half per cent in certain leading industries, whereas the cost of living had increased only about one-half per cent. This report is false on its face, and it does not require long research to find its falsity. It is plainly based on false premises. To mention only one point: In estimating the cost of living the learned statistician based his conclusions on the prices of certain staples. It is notorious, however, that these staples form only a small part of the cost of living. In New York, for instance, from one-quarter to one-third of the cost of living is paid as rent. Rent has increased tremendously in New York during that period. And yet the increase of rent is not included by the learned statistician. Yet such intentional deceptions are of little importance when compared with the unintentional deceptions, owing to the deceptiveness of the facts themselves. The comparative welfare of the working population of a country is usually measured by the wages paid, where the cost of living is the same. But the height of his wages are by no means an index to workingman's prosperity.

I shall not go into this question, however, now, for the reason that, as the careful reader has undoubtedly observed, *Marx does not speak* of the growth of the *poverty* of the working class. The omission of any reference to *poverty* is very significant in so careful a writer as Marx. This alone would be sufficient warrant for us in assuming that Marx did not consider the growing poverty of the working class a *necessary* result of the evolution of capitalism, all revisionist assertions to the contrary notwithstanding. But Marx did not leave any room for speculation on the subject, for in another place of *Capital* he states clearly and explicitly what he summarized here in a short sentence. He says there:

"The law by which a constantly increasing quantity of means of production, thanks to the advance in the productiveness of social labor, may be set in movement by a progressively diminishing expenditure of human power, this law, in a capitalist society — where the laborer does not employ the means of production, but the means of production employ the laborer

—undergoes a complete inversion and is expressed thus: the higher the productiveness of labor, the greater is the pressure of the laborers on the means of employment, the more precarious, therefore, becomes their condition of existence, viz., the sale of their own labor-power for the increasing of another's wealth, or for the self-expansion of capital. The fact that the means of production, and the productiveness of labor, increase more rapidly than the productive population, expresses itself, therefore, capitalistically in the inverse form that the laboring population always increases more rapidly than the conditions under which capital can employ this increase for its own self-expansion."

"We saw in part IV., when analyzing the production of relative surplus value: within the capitalist system all methods for raising the social productiveness of labor are brought about at the cost of the individual laborer; all means for the development of production transform themselves into means of domination over, and exploitation of, the producers; they mutilate the laborer into a fragment of a man, degrade him to the level of an appendage of a machine, destroy every remnant of charm in his work and turn it into a hated toil; they estrange from him the intellectual potentialities of the labor-process in the same proportion as science is incorporated in it as an independent power; they distort the conditions under which he works, subject him during the labor-process to a despotism the more hateful for its meanness; they transform his life-time into working-time, and drag his wife and child beneath the wheels of the Juggernaut of capital. But all methods for the production of surplus-value are at the same time methods of accumulation; and every extension of accumulation becomes again a means for the development of those methods. It follows therefore that in proportion as capital accumulates, the lot of the laborer, be his payment high or low, must grow worse. The law, finally, that always equilibrates the relative surplus-population, or industrial reserve army, to the extent and energy of accumulation, this law rivets the laborer to capital more firmly than the wedges of Vulcan did Prometheus to the rock. It establishes an accumulation of misery, corresponding with accumulation of capital. Accumulation of wealth at one pole is, therefore, at the same time, accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, *i. e.*, on the side of the class that produces its own product in the form of capital."

This is perfectly plain: the lot of the laborer, his general condition as a member of society, must grow worse with the accumulation of capital, *no matter whether his wages are high or low*. His *poverty*, in the ordinary sense of that word, depends on the amount of wages he gets, but not his *social condition*. And for two reasons. In the first place, because the social condition of any man or class can only be determined by a comparison with the rest of the members or classes of that society. It is not an absolute but a relative quantity. Even the question of poverty is a relative one and changes from time to time with the change of circumstances. But the question of social condition can never be determined except by a reference to the other classes of society. This is decided not by the absolute amount of worldly goods which the workingmen receive, but by the relative share which they receive in all the worldly goods possessed by society. Thus considered it will be found that the gulf between the capitalist and the workingman is constantly growing wider. This

is admitted by all as an empirical fact, and it has been proven by us in preceding articles as a matter of theory.

This circumstance that the welfare or misery of the working class must be considered and determined with relation to the wealth of society as a whole, and the share of the different classes therein, has been pointed out by Kautsky and Cunow. But Bernstein calls this "explaining away" the Marxian statements in Pickwickian manner, and points to the fact that Marx speaks also of "slavery, degradation, and exploitation." We confess that we cannot see the incongruity which Bernstein seems to see here. But we do see here once more how incapable Marx critics are of grasping even comparatively simple points of Marxian theory. Franz Oppenheimer raises the point of the growing "exploitation" of the working class in a theoretical way. Says he: "Since Marx does not set a limit to the wages which may be paid except the profit of the capitalists, nor the depth to which the rate of profit of the capitalist may fall except that it must permit the capitalist to accumulate, it is quite possible that the wages should rise to such an extent that the rate of profit of the capitalist should fall from say 10 per cent to 0.001 per cent. In such an event — he concludes triumphantly what he evidently considers a great argument — "'exploitation' would, of course, be of no practical importance, and the necessity of an economic revolution would be out of the question." One only marvels how a man of ordinary intelligence, not to speak of such an undoubtedly bright man like Oppenheimer, could have written down such an absurdity. Oppenheimer seems to have been so much impressed with the "fairness" of such a profit as the infinitesimal 0.001 per cent that he forgot the little circumstance that in order that the rate of profit should fall to such an extent and capitalistic accumulation continue with such a rate of profit the amount of capital which a workingman must be able to set in motion, and the surplus value produced by him, must be so enormously large, that the "exploitation," as Marx understands the term, will not only be of "practical" importance but will actually be very much greater than it is with a 10 per cent profit! This, by the way, is an additional illustration of the oft-repeated truth that facts or figures in themselves are absolutely meaningless and get their meaning only from their relation to other things.

The second, and chief reason, however, why the amount of wages received by the workingman does not determine his social condition is that the high level of his wages does not in any way carry with it the security of his employment. And by this is not merely meant the fact that the *weekly* wages which a laborer receives is no index to his yearly earnings by which alone his real income can be measured. Aside from this very important

fact, which must always be borne in mind, there is the still more important fact that, no matter what the yearly income of the laborer is, the fact that he does not earn it by steady employment at the part of his yearly income, but by intermittent employment at irregular and never-to-be-foreseen intervals, has in itself a determining influence on his social condition. It is this fact that makes the means of production in the hands of the capitalist a means of domination over the working class; it is this fact that turns the accumulation of capital into the accumulation of "oppression, slavery and degradation" on the side of the working class. The insecurity of the laborer's employment is the secret of the power of the capitalist class over the "free" workingman, it is the source of the mental and moral degradation of the working class which makes of them willing and obedient slaves, ready to kiss the hand that chastises them. For it gives the capitalist a far greater power over the life and liberty of the "free" workingmen than was ever enjoyed either by feudal baron over his serf or by the slave-holder over his chattel-slave.

That is also the secret of the great power of attraction and the great social and cultural importance of the labor-union. It is not the increase in wages which it may bring about that makes it the great factor in the life of the working class which it is. It is not for that that the great modern battles between labor and capital are fought no matter what their ostensible purpose might be. It is the protection from the grosser forms of arbitrariness on the part of the employer which it affords its members, thus increasing their security of employment, that forms the essence of the labor union, and it is for this that the great sacrifices are undergone by the workingman in fighting for the "recognition of the union" or in the "sympathetic strike," the two forms of fight most odious to and least understood by our "ethical" peace-makers between labor and capital, who would secure to each its "proper rights." Going out from the assumption that the workingman is nothing more than the beast of burden into which capitalism strives to convert him, they cannot understand why he should kick when the fodder in his trough is left undiminished. But the workingman knows instinctively the secret power of the chains which keep him in bondage, and he tries to break them, or at least weaken them. He is not content to be converted into, or to remain, a beast of burden; he wants to regain his moral courage, his manhood; and he knows that this can only be gained by organizing a social power which would do away or at least lessen the insecurity of his employment, the source of his slavery. Hence his fight for the union as such, which the good people cannot understand. But the capitalists understand it, hence their savage fight just at this point. They will pay higher wages, and work their men shorter hours, and grant a lot of other

"Just and reasonable demands," but they want no union, or at least the open shop, for they want to remain *"master of their own house."* In other words, they are content to keep their slaves a little better, but they will fight to the last ditch against the tampering with the chains of slavery, against the installing of moral courage, the fostering of the spirit of manhood in their slaves.

This struggle between capital and labor is the other side of the medal which Marx has described. It is the growing revolt of the working class which, as Marx says, is disciplined, united, and organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. This is not an independent process working independently of the so-called "impoverishment" or, rather, increased-exploitation process which we have described before, as some Revisionists seem to think but, on the contrary, accompanies it, and is partly its result. Nor is its effect necessarily or even usually such as to counteract the effects of the first process, as some other revisionists, notably Rudolf Goldscheid, the latest writer on this subject, think. While the growth of the discipline, union and organization may do away with a good deal of the *poverty* of the working class by forcing higher wages and better conditions of labor, and would therefore have the tendency of suspending in whole or in part the "impoverishment" tendency of capitalistic accumulation, as that term is used by the Marx critics, it can have no such effect on the tendencies described by Marx. That is to say, it cannot have the effect of removing the causes of the enslavement process; it cannot secure employment of the working class; it cannot suspend the operation of the economic laws which create an over-population, a reserve army, although it can organize rationally the distribution of the employment that there is, thereby palliating somewhat the sharpness of the economic process. But it can counteract the results of the economic process on the psychology of the working class. In the breast of the slave who is riveted to his master capital there still may develop the spirit of a free man and the courage to fight for freedom. The discipline, union, and organization of the working class cannot give him any freedom under capitalism because the economic conditions enslave him to capital, but they enable him to fight for some liberties while in slavery and for better conditions of servitude. This fight, however, in itself develops the desire for ultimate freedom and educates the workingman to an understanding of the causes and the conditions of the struggle, thus making of him an active and intelligent opponent of the present order. At the same time the struggle must be growing more intense as time passes on. For the fight only affecting the results of the downward tendency, and being powerless to remove its cause, whatever gains are

made cannot be kept unless the fight for them is kept up, and the fight must be intensified as the tendency increases. Hence the *growing revolt* of the working class of which Marx speaks. Hence also the absurdity of the passage quoted below from Rudolf Goldscheid's very recent booklet: "Impoverishment or Amelioration theorie?" which forms a new departure in Revisionism. This latest manifestation of Revisionism is in effect an admission of the fiasco of the old-style Revisionism, and proceeds in different manner. But only the form has changed, the substance, however, remained the same. Particularly, the metaphysical way of looking at things from their formal, stagnant, so to say, separatist, point of view, and the failure to see the inner connection between them while in motion. So says Goldscheid:

"First of all there can be no doubt that, no matter how much alike the purely economic tendencies and the psychological counter-tendencies evoked by them may be in forcing the development toward socialism, there still exists a certain antagonism between them. It is quite possible, for instance, that during long periods of time the psychological counter-tendencies may not be strong enough to exert any considerable influence on the purely economic tendencies, the concentration of industrial undertakings, the accumulation of capital, and the impoverishment of the masses. Where the circumstances have thus shaped themselves the hope for socialism lies principally in the economic tendencies. It is different, however, where the purely economic process has an equally strong psychological process to counterbalance it. There the growing accumulation of capital in the hands of the capitalist class will be accompanied by the growing political and economic power of the working class. And this growing political and economic power of the working class will manifest itself by checking more or less effectively the purely economic process of concentration and especially the process of impoverishment. Whoever, therefore, desires to uphold the Marxian theory of concentration and accumulation to its full extent in the face of the daily power of the organized prolétariat, does not realize that he has undertaken a quite hopeless task. For he asserts that the purely economic tendency of the capitalistic mode of production necessarily produces psychological counter-tendencies, and at the same time denies to these psychological counter-tendencies any real influence. It is therefore evidently very unwise in the socialist theoreticians to continue to expect the expropriation of the capitalists through the independent action of the inherent laws of capitalist production. On the contrary, the psychological counter-tendencies must paralyze the purely economic process with increased vigor and with the force of a natural law; that is to say, the breakdown of the capitalist system by its own weight must be steadily removed further and further from the realms of possibility."

The question of the breakdown of capitalism will be treated later, as already stated. But we want to point out here in addition to what we have already said, the dualism of the conception which regards the economic conditions and the psychological effects which these conditions produce upon the workingman as two independent motive powers, working not only without each other but neutralizing each other; the inability to grasp the process in its entirety and in its oneness, to see the monism of the process.

We also want to call attention here to the fact that the learned Marx critics who insist that by accumulation of misery as one of the tendencies of capitalistic accumulation, Marx meant the accumulation of poverty, and then try to disprove such tendency by pointing to the supposed ameliorated condition of the working class, fail to take into account the fact that whatever amelioration there is was brought about by the struggles of organized labor which Marx also predicted. The present condition of the working class is not merely the result of the *tendencies* of capitalistic accumulation, but of the tendencies of capitalist accumulation *as modified by the struggle of organized labor against them*. So much for Marx's proper prognosis of the tendencies of capitalism. As to the effect of amelioration on the evolution to socialism, such amelioration, if any there be, would only be significant if Marx had expected the advent of socialism from a net result of poverty; that is, if there were something in poverty itself which were favorable to socialism, an idea which no Revisionist has so far ascribed to Marx. But as we have seen it is this very struggle for amelioration, no matter what its immediate result during the progress of the struggle, that is the most important factor from the Marxian point of view in the final overthrow of capitalism, in so far as the active force which is to do the work is concerned.

While the spirit of revolt is growing and maturing in the working class this class evolves a new ideology. Living in constant struggle with the capitalist class and capitalist institutions which must array themselves in the struggle on the part of the capitalist class, he learns to hate these institutions and the whole ideology of the capitalist class. Being thrown on his own resources he begins to think for himself, to form his own ideology. But every ideology must have its base in the material conditions under which it is formed. The new ideology is based on and is the reflection of the new economic forces, the socialized means, modes and methods of production and distribution, and the growing collective control over them. His ideology is collectivism. In forming his ideology he is aided, on the one hand, by the very form of his struggle against the old order which is the collective mass struggle, and the benefits derived therefrom which can only be enjoyed while acting collectively and when organized in accordance with collective principles, and the well organized and developed democratic forms of government and activity; and on the other hand, by the dissolution of the old ideology in general, and in particular by its abandonment by the middle class, the class with which the working class comes into closest contact.

At the same time the working class is steadily advancing in economic power and independence in the sense that it takes possession of more and more responsible positions in the economic

life of the nation, diverts to itself, by means of the corporation and otherwise, all the growth of the concentration and centralization of capital, and particularly with the development of the corporate form of economic activity, the capitalist class abdicates its functions, the proper functions of a ruling class, those of economic management, into the hands of the working class. *The working class thus not only becomes revolutionary in its ideas, desires and aspirations, but it has the organized power to carry the revolution into effect, and is fully equipped to take hold of all social and economic activities and functions the day after the revolution, and carry them on successfully.*

L. B. BOUDIN.

Bulletin of the International Socialist Bureau

To the Laborers of All Countries:—

In despite of his pledged word, Nicholas II, the doubly perjured Czar, has dissolved the Douma as he violated the constitution of Finland. After concentrating troops at St. Petersburg, and dispersing the deputies by force, he has tried to deceive Europe by issuing a manifesto of which every word is a lie. He accuses the Douma of illegal acts, after himself imposing fundamental regulations upon it, contrary to his promises of October 30th. He accuses it of impotence after refusing it any power, after reducing it to a mere platform, which at least has served for denouncing the crimes of the bureaucracy. He reproaches it for having done nothing, after placing it where it could not accomplish a single parliamentary act.

International Socialism will waste no time in vain protests. Its appeal, now as before, is for action.

This new outrage from the man who caused the massacre of January 22 did not come as a surprise to the Socialist Party nor finds it unprepared. The crushing of the Douma was inevitable when once the coterie of functionaries and Grand Dukes perceived the weakness of the majority of the assembly, which in spite of the efforts of the Social-Democratic and Labor groups, followed tactics which could only enfeeble it.

A voting system with detestable restrictions, the most shameless administrative pressure brought to bear on the voters, an official distrust of the people which drove from the voting-urns such few proletarians as had access to them,—all this had created a factitious majority which in no way voiced the aspirations of the majority of the people. The deputies chosen by the liberal bourgeoisie have themselves proven by their attitude since the dissolution that they were wrong in acting in a vacillating fashion toward the government, hesitating as they did over the most urgent reforms. Have they not lost the confidence of the peasants by promising nothing but an inadequate agrarian reform, the adoption of which would not have restored the land to the country people? Have they not awakened the discontent of the laborers by offering them miserable palliatives in the place of thorough going reform? Have they not deceived all those who aspire ardently for liberty by their failure to take any virile resolution on the subject of amnesty, of pogroms, of the death penalty? And in spite of their repeated declarations of loyalty the czar has had for them nothing but contempt. At the opening of

the parliament he apologized to them for his fundamental regulations, and during the whole session he refused everything to them. Finally when by their own fault they found themselves without support and without strength, they were scattered passively like dead leaves before the autumn wind.

The czar's *coup d'etat* will result in compelling the liberal bourgeoisie to leave the stage of discourses and to choose between absolutism and revolution. Henceforth we are done with compromises and delays. After the experience we have had, even the most artlessly optimistic must be convinced that their wishes have no power to conciliate things that are opposite. The establishment of the douma without the power to carry out what it wants could not prevent the bureaucracy from plundering the treasury, from starving the peasants or from organizing, with the pecuniary assistance of the capitalists of western Europe, murders and outrages against the liberties of the laborers. But the revolution is not wrecked with the douma. On the contrary it is entering into a new and more decisive stage. Before putting an end to the parliamentary comedy, Nicholas II completed the economic and financial ruin of his empire. He destroyed among the conservative classes the idea of constitutional czarism. He opened the eyes of the peasants by refusing them the land. He rallied to the cause of the people a part of the navy and army. The sailors and soldiers after having proved the impotence of the liberal bourgeoisie returned to the stage, marshalled under the socialist flag. As at the beginning of the struggle, it is the proletariat which stands in the front rank against absolutism. To the laborers and the citizens are joined not only the peasants, who understand better each day that this union alone can give them this land, but also the intellectuals, more deeply imbued with our doctrines than in any other country. The liberal bourgeoisie, itself, if it does not wish to be condemned to absolute impotence will in many cases be forced to follow the current.

Two armies thus confront each other from this time on: the army of the czar and the army of the people, and between these two hosts the crash is inevitable. Victory will be ours, and so much the more decisive in proportion as the revolution shall better have centralized its strength, realized a unity of action and utilized its more abundant resources.

The revolution began by the strike, will continue as occasion requires by the strike, by the refusal of taxes and military services, by the occupation of the lands of the crown, the church and the nobility, by armed revolt with the co-operation of the sailors and soldiers whom socialist propaganda is winning every day to the new ideas. It will go on unfettered and without weakness until the day when czarism, without army, without money,

without credit, without power of any sort, shall find the people enthroned over their own destinies.

The history of Russian socialists answers for their future. They know how to compel the calling of a constitution and to do their duty to the end. It is our part to do ours. We can aid in the common work by two methods: *By preventing the Autocracy from obtaining money and by sending money to the socialists of Russia.*

The radical government of France, the reactionary government of Germany, the capitalist class of all countries are accomplices of the czar by lending him at heavy interest the pay for his soldiers, his executioners and his black bands. Let us find ways of warning the owning class that the Russian Republic of tomorrow will not pay the infamous debts which the czar incurs to pay assassins. Let us find ways of rallying to the cause of liberty all possible allies, in order to deliver millions of men from the implacable tyranny, and if after all we can do, the Holy Alliance of international reaction attempts to intervene in the conflict to crush the revolutionary uprising and to save the czar's tyranny, let us consort the necessary efforts for effective help to the people of Russia, who united still more closely at this juncture, will no longer draw any distinction between czarism, already near to death, and the invading foreigner guilty of planning an outrage against the self-government of a nation conscious of its rights. Give then and give generously. Let the mass of small sums heap up and be the power to decide the victory.

Let the watchword be, money for the victims of czarism.

Let every socialist, every class-conscious worker send his mite either to the central organization of his party or to the delegates' commission by our Russian comrades, or to the secretary of the International Socialist Bureau.

Translated by Chas. H. Kerr.

EDITORIAL

A. F. of L. Politics.

The most significant feature of the present campaign is undoubtedly the tactical somersault of the officers of the American Federation of Labor.

For a score of years the cardinal principle of these men has been "no politics in the trade union." Under the influence of this policy many national unions went so far as to incorporate clauses in their constitutions forbidding even a discussion of political questions in trade union meetings. In vain did the socialists point out that this was a good deal like tying up one hand before beginning a life and death fight with a powerful antagonist.

The officials were blind to all arguments. Frequently, to be sure, that blindness was produced by the greenbacks pasted over their eyes by capitalist politicians.

Never did this policy seem more firmly established than at the time of the last national convention of the A. F. of L. There the astonishing ruling was finally made by President Gompers that even to discuss the question whether the policy should be changed was "out of order." But just as it appeared as if this question was forever settled, and settled wrong, things began to happen.

The A. F. of L. lobby at Washington was snubbed a little harder than usual. Its measures were kicked into the waste basket instead of being softly dropped in as heretofore. Perhaps one of the reasons for this may be found in the result of the investigation by Mr. Job of the Employers' Association into the reality of the "labor vote" controlled by these leaders. He proved that the "goods delivered" were mostly green goods and gold bricks.

Consequently both old parties were refusing longer to grease the wheels on which the fakers were riding into power. This removed the before-mentioned bandages and at once they began to see things.

Furthermore the socialist vote was steadily growing and was beginning to make it unpleasant for these traders in working-class votes. The I. W. W. showed that this disaffection was spreading to the economic field, where the stationary condition of the A. F. of L. during a time of

rising prices and increasing employment was proving it out of adjustment to industrial conditions.

The Civic Federation racket was also beginning to play out. The class struggle was insisting on asserting itself in spite of scab banquets and juxtaposed pictures of capitalists and labor leaders. Indeed it is now reported that this precious organization is about to fall to pieces. Labor leaders and capitalists are alike sneaking away like rats from a sinking ship. We should think that the Civic Federation ship had pretty nearly touched bottom when it began to exploit the Avery-Goldstein combination, as it did in the last issue of the *Civic Federation Review*.

A climax to this series of events was reached by the result of Gompers' attempt at a grand-stand play and demonstration at Washington in support of the measures on which he had especially set his heart. This gave just the opportunity some of the politicians had been wanting, and they promptly called his bluff. Gompers was plainly told to do his worst or best. With a great flourish of trumpets he announced he was about to set in motion the two million votes of the A. F. of L. He did not hint that by this he meant to follow the successful and sensible example of the organized laborers of almost every other country in the world, from Australia to Russia and Japan, and start out on independent socialist lines. On the contrary he only announced that after the bosses had picked two men that he was going to decide which of them was the worst and punish him accordingly.

An elaborate list of questions was sent out to the congressional candidates. On their replies depended the decision whether they are "friends" to be "rewarded" or "enemies" to be "punished." The naive assumption that pre-election promises ever had anything to do with ante-election performances is worthy of comic opera. Indeed any discussion of the alleged merits of the plan would be an insult to the intelligence of our readers. What does capitalism care which candidate is elected so long as it makes the nomination?

Gompers has claimed that he was following the English example in this policy. This is a flat-footed lie. The English labor group that is really doing things is the one elected on socialist lines independently of the Liberals and Conservatives.

Nevertheless this move is not without important effects. It is already tearing the A. F. of L. in a dozen different directions. The power to confer the "favor of the union" is the largest political asset that has been within the grasp of the faker these many years. Hence there are more "conflicts of jurisdiction" on the political field than were ever dreamed of on the economic. The national executive council, the state federations, the various national unions, the city federated bodies are all disputing over the possession of this valuable asset and claim to control and be using it. In Chicago, for example, there is a still further split. There are three bodies which claim to have the only official stamp with which to O. K. political candidates in the name of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

Meanwhile every local meeting is torn by rival camps or camp followers of capitalist politicians.

In several instances this forcing of the faker into the open and thereby leading to discussion in the union has resulted in the endorsement of the Socialist Party. This was true in Milwaukee and St. Louis, as might have been expected from the strong socialist sentiment in the unions there. This has also happened with the brewers in Rhode Island, with many of the Vermont unions and some of the local unions of Chicago and probably many others of which we have not yet heard.

One of the results of this campaign is going to be the biggest cat and dog fight ever seen in the American labor movement. The next national convention of the American Federation of Labor ought to rival the Don-egal Fair as a scene of harmony and solidarity. This fight will be transferred to the floor of the unions and thousands of workers will be forced to discuss the relation of labor to political action. This cannot but bring about a tremendous growth in socialist sentiment and a weakening in the power of the present ruling clique, and in short such a general breaking up and realignment as always follows the entrance of the class struggle into any institution.

* * *

Our next issue will be a particularly strong one. Among the articles of especial importance will be one by Comrade Sinclair, discussing a new contribution to socialist literature, and a splendid analysis by Comrade Wentworth of the present political situation.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The powerful Brotherhood of Teamsters appears to be in a bad way. What the combined capitalists of Chicago were unable to do has been done by a small bunch of quarreling leaders. They have disrupted the union and sent thrills of joy into the hearts of the Jobs and Parrys and Posts. At the national convention in Chicago last month the long-threatened fight between the Shea and Young forces broke forth in all its fury, and, although disinterested third parties attempted to compromise the differences or secure the recognition of a flag of truce for a short period until efforts could be made to restore peace, they met with failure at every turn. Former President Young was determined to oust Shea and the latter was just as firm in his decision to hang on to office. There was no principle worthy of the name at stake—it was just a plain, disgusting fight for spoils, and the rule or ruin policy was the controlling force in both factions. Both sides did all in their power to pack the convention with their friends, howled at each other like a pack of hungry ward-heelers, and behaved generally in a manner that brought disgrace upon the whole labor movement. Finally the split came and two conventions proceeded to show the world how to save the workingman, while incidentally two sets of office-seekers were made happy. It is unnecessary to relate any details of the dual conventions other than to mention that the prevailing thought of each faction was to develop the most effective means to smash the opposition in the latest and most approved fashion. The brotherhood had about 80,000 members. The fight seems to have split the organization squarely in two, and the principal work in the future will be for both factions to strain every nerve to triumph over the enemy—not the capitalists, but the rival body. I am glad of one thing. Not a single Socialist was mixed up in this family row. There are not many Socialists among the teamsters for obvious reasons; there are none who hold influential positions. When George Innes, of Detroit, was boss of the brotherhood during a former factional fight he never hesitated to proclaim his hatred for socialism. He was forced down and out by Shea and then hollered around for a year or two for secession and disruption, while the latter also kicked out some of the New York locals because of alleged disloyalty in lining up with Young, who gained more or less notoriety as the pal of "Commissioner" Driscoll, who had an original and highly profitable way of inciting and settling strikes and boycotts. Of course, neither Shea or Young or Emmett Flood or any other so-called leader have the slightest sympathy for socialism. They are pure and simplers of the ultra-conservative stripe, and most of them delight to pick out "labor's friends" in the Republican and Democratic parties and punish "enemies" according to the rules prescribed by the Federation Executive Council. Gompers and his tribe of traducers, who are always telling each other that the Socialists are union-smashers and disturbers, will please take note of the fact that this latest

secession movement, like nearly all others, was not engineered by Socialists, but by their own kind of people, pure and simplers, so-called.

The national struggles of the printers and the bridge and structural iron workers are still in progress, both organizations having battled just about a year against overwhelming odds. It is well understood that when the printers' movement for the eight-hour day began to make headway Parry's Manufacturers' Association, Post's Citizens' Alliance, Penton's Foundrymen's Association and employers' associations in the various building trades and machinery trades combined for the purpose of destroying the International Typographical Union. They regarded the latter body as one of the best equipped organizations in the country, and realized that if the eight-hour day was won without much opposition other unions would immediately imitate the example of the printers and enforce the shorter workday and gain additional strength and prestige. On the other hand if the printers' union could be defeated and disrupted it would discourage the other organizations and make them tractable and easily dismembered. Consequently millions of dollars have been poured into this fight by both sides and the bitterest feelings have been engendered. During the past month the employers (known as the United Typothetae of America) held a convention in Buffalo, while the printers met in Colorado Springs. "No compromise!" was the slogan issued by both gatherings, and the indications are that the struggle will continue indefinitely in some places—so long as there is a local union in existence or employers are in the business who refuse to concede the printers' demands. The history of the Typographical Union shows that, as a rule, the printers never give up a fight. They have been engaged in contests with corporations that lasted a quarter of a century, having fought the heirs after their ancestors had disappeared. During the present struggle the printers have spent, up to date, about \$2,000,000, receiving little financial aid from other organizations. The A. F. of L. levied the constitutional assessment, which brought in less than \$50,000, and the printers have been depending upon their own resources, having assessed themselves 10 per cent of their wages weekly during the past ten months. But in the face of the most determined opposition that has ever been met by any union 85 per cent of the printers are now working on an eight-hour basis. In round numbers 40,000 members enjoy the shorter workday, about 5,000 are still on strike, and some 3,000 are bound by agreement or have not made a move for other reasons. In not a single city or town in North America have the printers been beaten or given up the contest. Complete victory appears to be in sight, as the assessment will be reduced to 8 per cent beginning Oct. 1 and gradually thereafter. The strike pay has ranged from \$7 a week to single men to \$12 and \$15 for married members.

The struggle of the bridge and structural iron workers is somewhat similar to that of the printers. The American Bridge trust, one of the United States Steel Corporation's brood, has decided to put the union out of business. The trust has been subjected to enormous losses in the erection of buildings and bridges and has spent large sums of money in herding together a small army of strike-breakers, private police, etc. But the iron workers have been peculiarly fortunate in obtaining work from independent contractors or in other lines of trade, so that very few are really on the strike roll. They are just as determined to-day to continue their battle against the trust as when it began a year ago. They realize that they have a hard struggle to go through, but it was bound to come sooner or later, and for that reason the iron workers are putting in their hardest knocks now in the endeavor to win or force the octopus to come to a satisfactory compromise.

There is no use in ignoring the fact that the contests of the future between capital and labor will be more desperately fought than were those

in the past. Besides the centralization of capital into trusts, employers' associations in every line of industry have been or are being formed with the avowed purpose of breaking up labor organizations wherever possible. The capitalists are becoming thoroughly class-conscious and are federating their associations and co-operating in every sanguinary struggle with labor. Moreover the former make no denial of the fact that they are asking for no quarter and granting none unless they are forced to do so, industrially, politically, socially or otherwise. Take any of the association organs or listen to any of their officials and spokesmen and you will learn that the American capitalists are becoming imbued with the same contempt and loathing for the working class that was displayed by the Roman patricians for the plebians or the French noblesse for the proletariat immediately preceding the revolution. And thus once more the position of the Socialists is being vindicated. How many times have our conservative and muddled labor leaders cried out against "arraying class against class?" Now let them go and sing their song to the scores of employers' associations and trusts that have pronounced death to organized labor. But even the most ponderous Gompersite will not undertake to convert the organized employers from their evil ways nowadays. No; the scheme is to fight back, and especially on the political field.

And that brings us to the dominant question before the house — politics. Politics! Ye gods, how Sam Gompers and "Jim" Duncan and "Dinny" Hayes and Lennon and the rest of the executive council have stood in A. F. of L. conventions and ridiculed political action and told us all about how the trade unions would settle all these questions, and more, too, in the good old way. But suddenly, after ruling that political resolutions have no place in A. F. of L. conventions (see proceedings of Pittsburgh convention), the "bill of grievances" is filed, and proclamations are issued to the rank and file to go into politics as early and as deeply as possible. "There should be no scramble for office," says the manifesto, in so many words. "Let us put our friends in places of power and punish our enemies." And forthwith Gompers hikes up to Maine, and, accompanied by a retinue of organizers, leads an onslaught against the enemy, the Republican Congressman Littlefield in the interest of our friend and savior, the Democrat McGillicuddy, of the same tribe as the Southern Bourbons who smash labor laws or turn down labor bills in a manner that earns for them the warmest commendation from the Parry-Post cabal. With Mr. Gompers were Stuart Reid, the premier A. F. of L. organizer, "socialist, too," who, in the presence of the writer and others, condemned in blistering language the Gompersian tactics more than once. Then there was Grant Hamilton, "representing the International Typographical Union," but just when he was given instructions to "represent" the I. T. U. is a mystery; ditto Sam. D. Nedrey, "representing" the I. T. U., although it's a million dollars to a cent that he can't present credentials to prove that the I. T. U. sent him into Maine. With Sam were also Walter Ames, "representing the International Association of Machinists"; Wentworth Roberts, organizer of the Lobster Fishermen's Union; Emmett Flood, "representing" Shea's teamsters; Jacob Tazelaar, Socialist-smasher, "representing" the Brotherhood of Painters, although it is news to the painters; Dominic Alessandro, "representing" the Building Laborers and Excavators' Union, and P. J. Byrnes, "representing" the Boot and Shoe Workers of America. It was a formidable array of "labor leaders," the meetings were well attended and Gompers made good speeches from the Democratic point of view.

The Socialists, while handing out literature and doing their stunt on the soap-box, can occasionally sit on the fence and watch the circus. It is safe to predict that Gompers will be a "dead un" long before he is through with the old gangs.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

GERMANY.

One of the phases of the activity of the German Social Democracy, of which less is known than of some others, is its "Labor Secretaries" and "Information Bureaus" for the benefit of the workers which the Party conducts in co-operation with the trade unions. These institutions furnish legal advice, assist in getting employment, attend to the official details of the insurance systems relating to workmen, etc. A recent report showed that there were 67 Secretaries and 111 Information Bureaus in operation during the past year. The expenditures of these amounted to over \$46,000. They were used by 273,696 persons, of whom 160,264 were unorganized workers. As all such use by non-unionists teaches a strong lesson of the helpfulness of organization, these institutions are powerful means for reaching the unorganized and bringing them into the unions, and later into the Social Democratic Party. The *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, in common with some other capitalist papers, complains, that because of the semi-official position enjoyed by these officials (a position due to the activity of socialist legislators) the socialist unions enjoy an unfair advantage over the Christian Unions.

The Social Democratic Party has just undertaken the establishment of two "Laborers' High Schools," to be located in Berlin. These will open their work during next September and the session will last about six weeks. The party undertakes the entire support of the students while at the school and estimates that an expenditure of between \$8,000 and \$10,000 will be necessary. The students will be chosen by the various local organizations of the party and the trade unions, who will also be expected to assist in their support in some cases. The students must be between 24 and 30 years of age, and the endeavor will be made to secure a representative from each political division of Germany. The teachers will be largely drawn from those already active in party service, thus obviating the necessity of paying salaries. The capitalist papers show their fear of the results of such systematic educational training for socialist speakers, writers and workers, by the abuse and ridicule which they heap upon it. The *Hanoverscher Courier* declares that it is an attempt to crush freedom of thought and to turn out a lot of believers in "Marxodoxy" who will blindly follow the party leaders. It never seems to occur to them that an educated following is apt to have its eyes opened instead of blinded.

The German National Congress of the socialists will be held at Mannheim on September 23d. The following are the subjects for discussion, with the names of the speakers who will present the topic to the Congress: "Parliamentary Activity," G. Schopflin; "May-day Celebration," R. Fischer; "The Political Mass-Strike," A. Bebel; "The International Congress of 1907," P. Singer; "Socialism and Popular Education," C. Zetkin and H.

Schulz; "Criminal Law, Procedure, and Punishment," H. Haase. A Socialist Woman's Congress will meet the day before the meeting of the party Congress, and a Congress of Socialist Youths the day after.

The principal interest of the Congress this year, as last, will center around the question of the "Mass-Strike" and the relation of the Party to the Labor Unions. Just at the present time a hot discussion is in progress over these points between the Central Committee of the party and the Labor Unions. To add to the confusion the "Localists," who seem in many ways to be the counterparts of the American "Impossibilists," although in a much milder and saner form than the most of those we have, are denouncing the party management, and Bebel in particular. Of course the capitalist press are certain that the party is going to split all to pieces. They have been certain of this constantly for the past twenty years.

BELGIUM.

The socialist daily of Brussels, *Le Peuple*, has been publishing a series of articles exposing the shameless immorality of King Leopold. They have been giving pictures of his various mistresses and describing his escapades in as great detail as decency will permit. The result is that a storm of denunciation has broken loose upon the Socialists in the Clerical papers. They denounce the action of the socialists as unpatriotic, and indeed almost everything else, but a desirable exposé of a kingly rouse. This is another instance of who are the real defenders of the family.

SWITZERLAND.

No country in Europe is furnishing more examples of military outrages against unarmed peaceful strikers than is Switzerland, the "armed nation" with its ideal military system, toward which many American socialists sometimes cast longing eyes. During a recent lock-out in Zurich, the streets swarmed with troops and citizens were insulted, attacked and interfered with in every possible manner.

ITALY.

The Italian socialist party is very badly divided at present, and there seem to be many reasons to expect an open rupture in the near future, although strong efforts are being made to avoid such a happening. There are three factions within the party ranging from the *syndicalists*, who wish to substitute direct action through strikes for political activity, to the extreme reform wing that wishes to almost merge the identity of the party in some of the radical capitalist parties. As has happened elsewhere, these two extreme wings sometimes pursue so much the same tactics that they find themselves together in the voting.

FINLAND.

The recent reform of the suffrage which is about to become a law confers the suffrage upon women as well as men. For this the socialist agitation was mainly responsible. To be sure the women comrades took the most active part in this phase of the movement, holding enormous mass-meetings throughout the country. One such demonstration, held last December, was attended by over 25,000 women, and issued a manifesto of which hundreds of thousands of copies were circulated.

VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA.

The letter which follows from a comrade in Melbourne gives a view of the class struggle in the antipodes. American socialists will recognize many familiar features; in fact with a little change of names the same letter might have been written from any one of a thousand different places in the world. Yet this does not mean that it is commonplace, any more than that capitalism has reduced even its own death struggles to a dead uniformity.

"Dear Comrades:—The labor movement here (politically) dates from the year 1890 when the workers were beaten in the maritime strike, which showed the non-political unionist his very little power against organized capital with political control. They formed a political wing of the trade unions and called it the Political Labor Council. There were a few dis-organized political organizations before that known as Progressive Leagues, etc., but nothing definite. The P. L. C. was formed and was confined practically to the metropolis. But they found that the Plutes could beat them every time with the country vote. Finding it impossible to win without extending to the country and fighting down the town vs. country theory which the Plutes were playing upon, a separation took place between the unionistic and political sections, the latter forming a distinct body with which unions could affiliate. There are now eighty-six of these affiliated branches, sixty of which are country, besides the affiliated trade unions, one of which, the Australian Workers' Union, has 25,000 members.

"We have just held our annual conference, at which we knocked alliances with other parties out. The Protectionist Association and the Chamber of Manufacturers both desired to enter into an agreement for fighting the Free Traders at the next Federal Elections to be held in November, but we passed them both up.

"Socialism is getting on in Australia first rate, I think. We have Tom Mann here with us in Victoria. He was organizing for the P. L. C. but is not now and has formed a straight out-and-out socialist party with 920 members now, and only seven months old. The socialist party originated out of a series of Sunday afternoon lectures being given by Tom Mann in the Gaiety Theatre, Melbourne. Their first rooms were in a basement, from which we got notice to quit, because we congregated too largely in front of the building (so we were told). We have now taken a commodious hall, known as the "Commonwealth Hall." We were holding Sunday night meetings in the Queens Hall, Bourke St., but had to get out of that as the Board of Health has ordered some alterations, and now we have taken the Bijou for Sunday nights. Last Sunday Comrade Tom Mann lectured on "Science, Religion and Socialism." Tonight, Sunday, May 6th, May Day here, he will lecture on "What Think Ye of Christ"? We had about 1,500 in the hall last Sunday. We are going to march in procession today, although the plutocratic Lord Mayor of Melbourne would not grant us permission, so there may be some fun. Tom is training speakers, male and female. There are between forty and fifty now and we are holding about ten meetings a week.

"We are doing some co-operative trading in the tea line at present, but intend the profits to go to the propaganda fund." The best bit of fun so far was an incident on the Yana Bank, where we hold our Sunday afternoon meetings. There is a by-law that literature must not be sold, so to get over the difficulty we gave the literature away, but had an umbrella for them to throw the money in. They altered the law so that it could not be given away and a detective came up and told Tom of it. That, of course, did not stop him and he gave them a splendid tongue lashing.

The detective took his name but we have heard nothing more of it, and we give the literature away.

"With best wishes for success in the good work and cause in general, I will conclude.

Fraternally,

R. G. BLOMBERG."

AUSTRIA.

The Austrian trade unions, which, in contrast to the German trade unions, make a great point of their Social-Democratic character, and decidedly repudiate the "neutrality" idea now so popular in Germany, have grown from 1892 thus:—

Form of Organisation	Year	SOCIETIES.				MEMBERS.		
		Central Societies.	National Groups.	Local Groups.	Total	Male.	Female.	Total
Trade Societies.	1892	10	240	474	724	44,390	2,216	46,606
	1896	17	284	775	1,076	95,221	3,448	98,669
	1899	30	242	1,284	1,556	113,778	5,556	119,334
	1901	32	266	1,273	1,571	113,672	5,378	119,050
	1902	47	241	1,397	1,685	129,290	5,888	135,178
	1903	51	192	1,623	1,866	145,146	9,519	154,665
	1904	45	121	2,108	2,277	176,066	13,055	189,121

Form of Organisation	Year	SOCIETIES.				Members.		
		Central Societies.	National Societies.	Local Societies.	Total	Male	Female	Total
General Trade Societies and Labour Education League	1892	—	580	4	584	21,690	2,047	23,737
	1896	—	539	19	558	16,994	2,346	19,277
	1899	—	612	95	707	34,780	3,650	38,439
	1901	—	674	49	723	29,040	4,450	33,590
	1902	—	612	73	685	26,240	3,070	29,310
	1903	—	520	83	603	20,383	2,544	22,927
	1904	—	446	30	476	15,170	1,340	16,530

The compositors are the best organized, having 73.25 per cent. of the workers in the trade union; dock workers, 38.46 per cent.; hatmakers, 28.86 per cent.; lithographic workers, 20.28 per cent.; bookbinders, 17.36 per cent. In all, out of 2,150,614 workers of whom record is to be had, 183,045 are organized. Small enough in all conscience, but growing and capable of making themselves felt even now on occasion. From 1902 to

1904 the annual income rose from 2,230,000 crowns to 3,392,000 crowns in 1904, or in four years they raised a total of 11,182,355 crowns. These figures are especially interesting in view of the fact that the Viennese workers are just entering on a general strike to protest against the stopping of the Bill for universal suffrage.

The workers in the Vienna building trade, 50,000 men, have just won a victory after a seven weeks' strike, a scale having been accepted by the masters embodying most of their demands. A good example of discipline was given by about 7,000 members, who left Vienna on the request of the union, when the latter found that their departure would make it easier to carry out the fight for the rest.—*Justice*.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE RISE OF THE NEW WEST, 1819-1829, by *Frederick J. Turner*. *Harper & Bros.* Cloth, 366 pages, \$2.00.

The volumes of the "American Nation" series, of which this is the fourteenth, are very unequal in merit. The present one stands out conspicuously above any of those that have previously appeared. In the method applied, material collected and the manner of presentation, it is suggestive of the way that history will be written in the future. How close it is to the socialist point of view is seen from his statement that "We must begin with a survey of the separate sections . . . and determine what were the main interests shown in each, and impressed upon the leaders who represent them."

On the whole, the economic interpretation of history, including the class struggle, is used as a basis of the work. A preliminary survey of the three great sections shows that in New England this period "witnesses the transition of the industrial center of gravity from the harbors to the waterfalls, from commerce and navigation to manufacture"; while in the South the industrial evolution begun by the cotton-gin was in full swing and it had progressed to the point where the cotton industry was already leaving the sea-coast. Virginia's ancient tide-water aristocracy, based on tobacco and cotton, was declining, until "Randolph prophesied that the time was coming when the masters would run away from the slaves and be advertised for by them in the public papers." (Perhaps this may account for the well-known abolitionist tendencies of Washington, Jefferson and other fathers of the republic.)

After all "the rise of the new West was the most significant fact in American history in the years immediately following the war of 1812." The upper Mississippi Valley and the Ohio Valley were being filled up at a rapid rate throughout this time, while even in the far West the Santa Fe trail was laden with commerce, and fur traders were pushing into the head waters of the Columbia and the Missouri. Following the crisis of 1819 there arose "a movement comparable to the populist agitation of our own time." This agitation finally landed Jackson in the presidential chair. The main struggle of the time, however, was over the question of the tariff and internal improvements, although the slavery question blazed forth at the time of the Missouri Compromise. All of these questions are shown to be the expression of diverse economic interests. The rising manufacturing class allied itself with the West, which desired home markets and internal improvements. Against these were arrayed the New England commercial and the Southern plantation interests. Manifestly these lines of union and division were temporary and this transitional character accounts largely for the lack of clear party division, which have led many historians to designate this period of "The Era of Good Feeling." By the close of the period under discussion there had arisen the rearrangement of forces which was to prevail for the next generation.

One of the most striking illustrations of the author's presentation of the relation between political opinions and industrial conditions is given in the following quotation:

"In 1816 the average price of middling uplands (cotton) in New York was nearly thirty cents, and South Carolina's leaders favored the tariff; in 1820 it was seventeen cents, and the South saw in the protective system a grievance; in 1824 it was fourteen and three-quarters cents, and the South Carolinians denounced the tariff as unconstitutional. When the woollens bill was agitated in 1827, cotton had fallen to but little more than nine cents, and the radicals of the section threatened civil war."

There is a wealth of references, and a carefully prepared bibliography. The reading of such a work as this will form an excellent foundation for an understanding of the socialist philosophy of history, and its reading by some socialist writers and speakers might enable them to avoid some of the errors concerning American history which are so common in socialist works. We only wish that the whole of American history might be covered in the same manner.

STUDIES IN SOCIALISM, by *Jean Jaures*, translated with an introduction by *Mildred Minturn*. *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. Cloth, 197 pages, \$1.00.

This series of essays, which first appeared in a Paris daily, are, as might be expected from their method of publication, of very unequal merit. On the whole, Jaures is best when he is either painting the pictures of the future or criticising radical non-socialist parties. It is in such chapters as those of "The General Strike" and "The Need of a Majority," or "The Socialist Aim," in which the valuable features are most striking. However, in "Liebknecht on Socialist Tactics" he presents some of the opinions of the great German socialist which are not commonly known to English speaking socialists, and which will answer as an antidote to impossibilist tendencies.

The translator's introduction, it seems to us, had better have been omitted, as she is all too plainly attempting to explain something concerning which she knows very little. It is purely a utopian idea of socialism which she sets forth in the beginning, and when she gives Menger's state socialist definition as "a clear statement of the main socialist theory" she is simply introducing confusion where there is already plenty of that commodity. Again, she gives on page XXXI a list of supposed authorities on the organization of the socialist state and not one of them is a socialist, unless we except the Fabians. Again, her statement of the Marxian position is really a parody on Marxian economics, but for this she is not entirely to blame, since Jaures has sometimes accepted the same parody for purposes of argument. Again, there is altogether too favorable a statement of what Millerand accomplished while he was minister of commerce. His famous ten-hour law she neglects to state extended the hours of labor for women and children in almost as many instances as it shortened them. Again, we wonder if Jaures really authorized the statement which she makes that he entered into socialist unity while retaining all his old beliefs. We would rather believe in Jaures' honesty than in his translator's opinion and conclude that he meant what he said when he accepted the international position.

In spite of these defects the work is a valuable addition to the socialist literature since it presents a side which has hitherto been lacking for readers of English, at least in American publications.

SOCIALISM, A SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION OF SOCIALIST PRINCIPLES, by *John Spargo*. *Macmillan Co.* Cloth, 257 pages, \$1.25.

Of popular summaries of socialism there is no end, nor should there

be so long as there are people to be enlightened. There is nothing particularly new about this work, nor could there be, in so far as subject matter is concerned. The story has been told too often to be original in the retelling. We have the same sketch of the Utopians, the transition via the "Communist Manifesto" to scientific Marxism, followed by the chapters on "The Materialist Conception of History," "Capital," "The Law of Concentration," "The Class Struggle," and "The Economics of Socialism," which are found in many similar works in English and other languages.

The only question is then, Has Comrade Spargo done it better than those who have gone before? The verdict must certainly be, Yes. There is no doubt but what this is the best popular exposition of socialist doctrines so far printed. If we were to offer a criticism it would not be on his chapter on the "Outlines of the Socialist State," concerning which he expects hostile comment; indeed we think that he will be pleasantly mistaken on this point and that nearly all socialists will agree with him.

From a pedagogical point of view,—and such a work as this must be approached largely from that point,—one cannot but wish that the author had been somewhat more familiar with the evolution of socialist thought in America. It would have added strength to have used references to the very many clear expressions of class-consciousness which were even more prevalent in America in the late twenties and early thirties than they were in England. Illustrations of the class struggle could have been drawn with much more force from American history than from Medieval Europe. He does this when it comes to present illustrations, but seems ignorant of the past.

One might also question the advisability of inserting so transient a thing as a national platform, which has at the most only two years more to run, in a work intended for permanent reference.

We recognize that most of these criticisms are somewhat those of the purist, akin to the complaint of an omitted comma or a split infinitive, yet in a study of a work covering so familiar a ground, this is almost the only method of practical criticism. After all the work as a whole deserves so much commendation that even these slight complaints are almost out of place.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Start Socialist Libraries.

FIVE DOLLARS' WORTH OF BEST SOCIALIST BOOKS FREE
WITH A SHARE OF STOCK BOUGHT DURING SEPTEMBER.

The socialist co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company is not a new experiment. It is a success. It is putting out nearly all the socialist books in permanent binding that are being sold in the United States. It is publishing more new socialist books each year than any other house in the world, not even excepting the leading book publishing houses of Germany.

This publishing house is owned by 1445 socialist locals and individual socialists who have each subscribed \$10.00 for a share of stock. This stock carries the privilege of buying all our books at cost but it draws no dividends. Moreover no officer of the publishing house draws more than ordinary wages for his work. Every dollar that comes in from the sale of books or the sale of stock is used to publish more books of the sort the Socialist Party needs.

Nearly all the shares have been paid for at the full price of \$10.00 each and no premium of any kind has been given with them. Just now, however, there is an urgent need for about \$3000.00 to pay for printing the first American edition of Marx's "Capital," a new popular edition of Morgan's "Ancient Society" and a number of new and important books by European and American writers, including Labriola's "Socialism and Philosophy," Lafargue's "Social and Philosophical Studies," Dietzgen's "Positive Outcome of Philosophy," Fitch's "Physical Basis of Mind and Morals," Kautsky's "Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History," and a library edition of Work's "What's So and What Isn't."

We could borrow the money for bringing out these books, but instead of paying out interest we prefer to give enough books free to purchasers of stock to make sure of selling 300 shares within the next few weeks.

Here is our offer: to any one sending \$10.00 for a share of stock before the end of September 1906, we will send free of charge any books published by ourselves to the amount of \$5.00 at retail prices. If it is desired that we prepay the charges, 50c. must be added to this price, otherwise the books will be sent at purchaser's expense. To any one

just starting a socialist library we recommend the following selection of \$5.00 worth of books to apply on this offer:

The Socialists, Who They are and What They Stand for, by John Spargo.

Collectivism and Industrial Evolution, by Emile Vandervelde.

The Social Revolution, by Karl Kautsky.

The American Farmer, by A. M. Simons.

Principles of Scientific Socialism, by Charles H. Vail.

The Communist Manifesto, by Marx and Engels.

Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, by Frederick Engels.

Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History, by Antonio Labriola.

The offer, however, is not limited to these eight books, but it is limited to books which we publish ourselves, and does not apply to the volumes in the Social Science Series which we import nor to any other books of other publishers. This offer will not appear in the REVIEW again and it will not hold good after October 1, 1906. A copy of "What to Read on Socialism" containing a full description of the publishing house will be mailed promptly to anyone requesting it.

REVOLUTIONARY ESSAYS IN SOCIALIST FAITH AND FANCY.

This remarkable volume by Peter E. Burrowes was published three years ago by a publishing house that failed shortly after. It was cordially welcomed by the socialist press, and then forgotten, because no one reminded people of it.

But it is too good a book to stay forgotten, and our publishing house has now bought the entire edition from Comrade Burrowes. It is a book that the socialist movement needs. As one reviewer says, "he has caught the very soul of Socialism in his hands and has put it between covers."

Burrowes is not only a thinker, he has an artistic way of saying things in such a way as to make them stick in the memory. Take this sentence chosen at random from his essay called "The New Way in Politics":

Politics is now the device of maintaining the property dominion over the lives of the poor by two parties, so staged as to seem real antagonists; so historied, newspapered and talked about as to make the victory of one or the other at the ballot boxes seem to be the victory of something other than of the property and capitalistic element of society. Socialism strips this mask off politics and exposes the naked truth of the class war necessarily made by the private capitalist on the dignity and liberty of all the rest of mankind, and therefore of the war made by the Democratic and Republican parties on the liberty and manhood of Americans.

Now read these short paragraphs from "The Revolutionary Message":

The human mind can have no higher function than that of preserving, enriching and prolonging human life.

Economic pressure, that is the need and the way of getting our bread, is the dynamic force in history; the efficient cause of evolution and the sufficient explanation of our morals, ideals and religions.

Human progress is an intellectual and industrial movement from the life of the individual to the community life.

The sentences quoted are a fair sample of the whole book. It contains fifty-six short essays, making in all 320 pages. It is a book that every socialist will want in his library, not to read through in a day or a week, but to take in small doses and think over. It is also an excellent book for propaganda among people of rather more than average education.

The New York price was \$1.25; our price is \$1.00 postpaid to any one, 60c. to our stockholders.

MAY BEALS' STORIES.

There is so much of what we socialists want said in "The Rebel at Large" that our own comrades may be biased witnesses on the question of the literary merit of the book. So here is what the *Chicago Daily News* says:

"The Rebel at Large" is not a colonial tale nor a southern wartime romance, but the title of a collection of seventeen stories by May Beals, written avowedly to carry forward the message and spirit of socialism. They voice the patience and pathos in the lot of the oppressed of earth and stir a revolt against industrial, social and religious creeds which fail to meet present-day conditions in the uplift of mankind. Intensity of conviction, seriousness of purpose and a fresh, crisp individual way of treating time-worn material make of some of these little sketches veritable mosaics.

Mechanically "The Rebel at Large" is a volume the size and style of the Standard Socialist Series and Library of Science for the Workers, but bound in green cloth with a new cover design. This design is also used in the second edition of "God's Children," by James Allman, a modern allegory which incidentally introduces a first-class soap-box speech on socialism. Fourteen volumes in the Standard Socialist Series are now ready and two more will appear this month. With the seven volumes of the Library of Science for the Workers and the two books of fiction just described, we are thus offering twenty-five volumes of uniform size at 50c. each; to stockholders 30c. postpaid or 25c. if purchaser pays expressage. In the International Library of Social Science, retailing at \$1.00 with the same discounts, we have eight volumes now ready, while two more will appear during September.

SOCIALIST BOOKS IN PRESS.

Marx's Capital. All the type for the first volume has already been set, and if no accidents delay us, copies should be ready for delivery by the middle of October. This announcement refers to the first volume, which has been revised by Ernest Untermann from the last German edition, and will also, unlike any previous edition, contain a full alphabetical index of subjects. The price will be \$2.00, and we hope to receive enough advance orders to come somewhere near covering the cost of the plates.

Lafargue's Social and Philosophical Studies. The final proofs of this book are being corrected as we go to press, and we expect to have it ready toward the end of September. This will be Vol. 15 of the Standard Socialist Series, price 50c. It consists of a series of keenly critical

studies of the causes of religion and of abstract ideas. Lafargue takes the position made familiar by Spencer in pointing out that the idea of God doubtless originated in the attempts of the savage to explain the unknown elements in his daily experience. But Lafargue brings this theory down to date in a new and striking fashion when he shows that the modern capitalist has the same need of an unknown power to explain the events of his daily life that are determined by a social environment which he does not in the least understand. The wage-worker on the contrary, Lafargue tells us, sees far less, so far as his personal experiences and welfare go, of these mysterious social forces. His daily bread comes in a prosaic fashion from his daily work, and he knows it. He is thus not biased in the direction of mysticism, consequently the materialistic interpretation of things is more readily understood by him than by the average capitalist. The author's study of the origin of the idea of goodness is almost equally startling to those accustomed to conventional ways of thinking. By an ingenious series of tables tracing the derivation of words from the Greek and Latin through the various languages of modern Europe, he demonstrates that the ideas of goodness and property are inextricably interwoven, in other words that historically the "good" man is the man with the "goods."

The translation is by Charles H. Kerr; the author says of it in a recent letter: "Je vous expédie en même temps que cette lettre les épreuves corrigées. Ma femme* et moi nous les avons lues attentivement et, comme vous le verrez, nous avons fait peu de changements. Votre traduction est très bonne; vous avez rendu fidèlement le texte français. J'essai d'être concis et clair; votre traduction est concise et claire."

The Physical Basis of Mind and Morals. This new work by M. H. Fitch of Colorado is already electrotyped and should be ready not far from the middle of September. It will be the eleventh volume of the International Library of Social Science (price \$1.00). It is a noteworthy book in that the author, reasoning from wholly different data from those usually discussed by socialists, arrives at identical conclusions. Especially interesting is the fact that Lafargue and Fitch, each writing without a knowledge of what the other was doing, unite in exposing the imbecility of the capitalist-minded philosophers who think and try to make others think that they are wholly emancipated from religious superstition, but are led by their class environment to make a new God for themselves out of the "Unknowable," and to put a large share of their mental energy on things that can not be known to the exclusion of things that can be known. Mr. Fitch's chapter entitled "Herbert Spencer and his Mistaken Disciples" is by itself an admirable stimulus to clear thinking.

The Positive Outcome of Philosophy. This long-promised volume of over 400 pages contains the three most important works of Joseph

* Mme. Laura Lafargue, who as stated above assisted in correcting these proofs, is the only surviving daughter of Karl Marx.